This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

B 441256


ARTES
SCIENTIA
VERITAS
LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
SI QUAERIS PENINSULAM AMOENAM
CIRCUMSPICE

BX
P201
.M5

23394

METHODIST

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

1884.

VOLUME LXVI.—FOURTH SERIES, VOLUME XXXVI.

D. D. WHEDON, LL.D.,
D. CURRY, LL.D., } EDITORS.

NEW YORK:
PHILLIPS & HUNT.
CINCINNATI:
CRANSTON & STOWE.
1884.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME LXVI.—1884.

JANUARY NUMBER.

PAGE

PRAYER AND SCIENCE 5
Rev. D. D. Wheedon, LL.D., Editor.

THE EARLIEST CREED OF MANKIND 20
Rev. W. F. Warren, D.D., President of Boston University, Boston, Mass.

OUR PERIODICAL LITERATURE 46
Rev. John F. Hurst, D.D., Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

LETTERS AND MEMORIALS OF JANE WELSH CARLYLE 60
Morgan Callaway, Jun., Professor in Emory College, Oxford, Ga.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE DISCIPLINE 80
Rev. William N. M'Elroy, D.D., Jacksonville, Ill.

THE PROBLEM OF OUR AFRICAN POPULATION 108
Rev. Abel Stevens, LL.D., Paris, France.

PROBATION AFTER DEATH. [First Article] 121
Rev. D. A. Wheedon, D.D., Bristol, R. I.

DR. ELIPHALET CLARK 148
Rev. Henry B. Ridgaway, D.D., Professor in Garrett Biblical Institute.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies 157

Foreign Religious Intelligence 175

Foreign Literary Intelligence 178

Quarterly Book-Table 180

APRIL NUMBER.

"WESLEY'S DESIGNATED SUCCESSOR" 205
Rev. L. R. Dunn, D.D., Elizabeth, N. J.

WILLIAM TYNDALE, THE FIRST TRANSLATOR OF THE BIBLE INTO THE PRINTED ENGLISH VERNACULAR 227
Rev. R. Wheatley, D.D., Katonah, N. Y.

BISHOP HURST'S BIBLIOTHECA THEOLOGICA 249
Charles J. Little, Ph.D., State Librarian of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa.

AGNOSTICISM 266
Rev. Marcus D. Buell, Hartford, Conn.

THE METHODIST DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT 278
Rev. Prof. John J. Tigert, S.T.D., Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF "THE DEVIL." 301
Rev. Daniel Curry, D.D., New York.

PROBATION AFTER DEATH. [Second Article] 316
Rev. D. A. Wheedon, D.D., Bristol, R. I.

THE GNOMIC AORIST IN THE NEW TESTAMENT 337
Rev. H. A. Buttz, D.D., President of Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.

Synopsis of the Quarterlies 348

Foreign Religious Intelligence 360

Foreign Literary Intelligence 365

Quarterly Book-Table 369

JULY NUMBER.

PAGE

THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH. [FIRST ARTICLE].... 405
Rev. MILTON S. TERRY, S.T.D., New York.

THE OPIUM TRAFFIC IN CHINA. [SECOND ARTICLE] 420
Rev. S. L. BALDWIN, D.D., Nyack, N. Y.

THE REGENERATION AND GLORIFICATION OF THE BODY 439
Rev. J. C. JACKSON, Chillicothe, Ohio.

WESTMINSTER ABBEY..... 449
Rev. B. H. BADLEY, Lucknow, India.

RUSSIA AND ENGLAND IN CENTRAL ASIA..... 467
Rev. A. C. GEORGE, D.D., Chicago, Ill.

AUTHORSHIP OF ECCLESIASTES 493
Rev. W. W. DAVIES, Ph.D., Delaware, Ohio.

WILLIAMS'S "MIDDLE KINGDOM"..... 503
Rev. E. WENTWORTH, D.D., Sandy Hill, N. Y.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS 527
EDITOR.

THE LATE GENERAL CONFERENCE: THE SITUATION, THE WORK, AND THE OUTLOOK..... 551
EDITOR.

SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES..... 561
FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE..... 577
FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE..... 581
QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE..... 584

OCTOBER NUMBER.

THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH. [SECOND ARTICLE.] 605
Rev. MILTON S. TERRY, S.T.D., Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.

THE LAST DAYS OF JOHN WICLIF—HIS DEATH..... 624
Prof. A. B. HYDE, Alleghany College, Meadville, Pa.

THE LOGIC OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF..... 642
BORDEN P. BOWNE, Professor in Boston University, Boston, Mass.

A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF HAMLET..... 665
Rev. A. A. LIPSCOMB, D.D., LL.D., Athens, Ga.

THE POPES AT AVIGNON..... 678
Prof. HARRINGTON, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES..... 697
Editor.

THE CATHOLIC DOGMA OF CHURCH AUTHORITY..... 716
H. K. CARROLL, Esq., Religious Editor of The Independent.

BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS 738
Rev. ROBERT CROOK, D.D., Mount Vernon, N. Y.

SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES..... 757
FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE..... 776
FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE..... 780
QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE 784

BENJAMIN F. BLAINE, M. D.

PORTLAND, MAINE.

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1884.

ART. I.—PRAYER AND SCIENCE.

A Review of Mr. Wakeman's "Science and Prayer," in the North American Review.

"JEHOVAH is dead!" was the jubilant exclamation of a German agnostic philosopher. "Theology is the past tense," is the first sentence of Mr. Wakeman, more modest in expression, but synonymous in import and equal in its mistake. "Theology is the past tense," we cheerfully grant; a glorious past tense; and statistical science predicts a future tense far more illustrious. The Christian Church is growing more rapidly than the world's population; and our evangelical Christianity is growing the most rapidly of all the forms of Christian doctrine. And the spread of Christianity has never been so rapid as in the last fifty years. These facts have been critically and arithmetically demonstrated in Dorchester's "Problem of Religious Progress," so that after all these hostile jubilations, derived from "science," science herself declares that Jehovah still lives, and that Christianity will rule in beneficent power long after Mr. Wakeman and myself are forgotten.

Mr. Wakeman maintains the mechanical nature of the system of the universe, and the exclusion therefrom of any controlling Mind. This mechanical universe he holds to be governed by unintelligent laws, without any intellective lawgiver. "These laws are: the indestructibility of matter, the correlation and equivalence of forces, gravitation, and the law of evolution." Brevity, of course, precludes him from being able to

demonstrate that so adaptive and so planned a system excludes the planning mind; and he therefore refers us for that demonstration to Herbert Spencer's "First Principles," chaps. 4–9. The same brevity, as well as the absence of any argument presented, precludes our answering Mr. Spencer's supposed demonstration. We can only, in like manner, refer for its refutation to Janet's celebrated work on "Final Causes."

Next, from this high *priori* ground of Agnosticism, Mr. Wakeman comes down to the issue upon the platform of our theism, and boldly maintains that the attributes of our God, humanly though we state them, shut his ears to prayer. "The ism," he says, "assumes a God who is *anthropomorphic* and yet"—. Pause a moment there. We respectfully suggest to Mr. Wakeman whether that epithet "*anthropomorphic*," so popularly reiterated by our agnostic philosophers, is not below their intellectual level; whether it has not too much of an *ad captandam* quality. Between God and man we hold there to be no other resemblance or identity than that they are both SPIRIT. It is not likeness of physical image, but an analogy of spiritual nature. And our Christian theism holds that there, doubtless, are grades and ranks of spirit beings, invisible "principalities and powers," occupying the immense vacuity between the infinite God above and finite man below, practically infinite in number; so that to say that God is anthropomorphic is simply to say that God is at the summit of the sublime spiritual column of which man is the lowest base. Moreover, there are countless instances in which the finite thing unquestionably is a miniature, and even the reduced identity of an infinite. Newton, it is said, conceived the idea of gravitation from the fall of an apple, so that Newton conceived the astonishing absurdity of supposing that the universe is *appleomorphic!* Space we suppose our learned friend conceives as infinite; and yet space can be inclosed in a quart bottle, and so infinite space is *bottleomorphic.* Law we know is proclaimed by these illustrious thinkers to be universal, all pervading, almighty. But law does condescend from its infinity to rule the humblest ultimate atom of matter; and so universal, all-pervading, almighty law is *atomomorphic.* Force, we suppose, is conceived to be practically infinite and all-controlling. But this same force does reside in the living human body; inclosed, as we

may say, within the human skin; and so is truly shaped to and incarnated in the human form. And so infinite, almighty force is *anthropomorphic!* So Mr. Wakeman himself holds to an almighty anthropomorphic but unintelligent ruler of the cosmos. If there can be an infinite and a finite force, why not an infinite and a finite spirit? And wonderful it is to conceive how as truly perfect is infinite, omnipresent law in the infinitely small as in the infinitely great. Herschel and Clerk Maxwell affirm that the ultimate atom has the character of "a manufactured article." An English rhymester has illustrated the downward travel to infinite littleness in quaint style nearly as follows:

> So naturalists affirm the flea
> Hath lesser fleas on him that prey;
> And these have lesser fleas that bite 'em,
> And so descend *ad infinitum.*

And thus the infinite condescends to finite itself to the infinitesimal! Science itself therefore demonstrates that the infinite can move in the slightest movements, can incarnate itself in the minutest objects, and operate under guise of most truly finite causes.

And next, as our thought peers down and down this descending line of fleas, not only is each flea mentally seen to be perfectly shaped by infinite force, and that force *to be ruled* by infinite law, but that law *obeys the authority of mind.* For, as experience reveals that the shaping of matter is ruled by the pressure of force, and force is by experience seen to be ruled by law, so it is as clear that law is modified and ruled by reason, and reason can be conceived as existing in mind alone. More literally we might drop law out, and say that force itself is ruled by mind, law being nothing more than the *way* in which reason consistently and regularly controls and directs the course of things. Mind we know, by conclusive psychological experience, does volitionally compel force to shape matter to its own purpose and model; and Mr. Wakeman can find nothing else than mind in the universe that does so compel. As there is nothing that solves the operation of matter but force, and nothing solves the control of force but law, so nothing solves the imposition and direction of law on force but mind. The proof that the solar system is ruled by mind,

is just the same as the proof that my fellow man is ruled by mind. I know, indeed, my own individual mind by consciousness; but I cannot walk into my fellow being's consciousness and know his mind, and can only *infer* the existence of his mind by external rational-like effects. There is, therefore, the same reason to infer that intelligence rules in that mass of matter called nature as there is in that mass of matter which I call my fellow man, namely, the intelligential effects seen. The atheist ought to deny the existence of any consciousness but his own. If the rational effects in human mechanism demonstrate human mind, so the rational effects in a superhuman mechanism demonstrate superhuman mind. Why do we recognize mind in the formation, the adaptation, of the parts of a flea? Because every thing is known by its *properties*, and this shows the objective *properties* which experience proves to belong to mind. And then, if infinite force is ruled by mind, that mind is also as infinite as force. And that unity of infinite force and infinite mind we call God. And if being intelligent is being anthropomorphic, Mr. Wakeman is welcome to the conclusion.

And this condescension of infinite Perfection to the finities —to their imperfections, contingencies, and littlenesses—is the very result of its perfection. An infinite unable to reach the humblest infinitesimal would fail to be an infinite. It is its perfect extension to the minutest particle of existence that constitutes infinity. A perfect force impels the minutest atom, a perfect law descends to the minutest event, a perfect Providence takes care of the minutest animalcule. It is not confused by infinities of number or immensities of space. It takes care of one animalcule with as concentrated an omniscience as if that one animalcule were the only object in universal space. And this results from the very infinitude and perfection of that Providence. In the force, the law, or the providence, the omission of the care of one infinitesimal would be an absolute imperfection.

And, what is specially to my purpose, this infinite law-ruled force, whether ruled by mind or not, and whether anthropomorphic or not, condescends to the *prayers* of the minutest flea. In order to live, the flea must have all the parts of his body put together and symmetrized; the apparatus and the material for eating and nutriment must be supplied; the

appetites and instincts be placed in the organism, prompting and directing it to perform the self-nourishing process. These needs and wants for self-completeness and conservation are his unconscious *prayers;* and infinite law-ruled force adjusts itself to and answers those *prayers.* Much more may it condescend to the prayers of man, who is in the very image of God. The expressed prayers of man, which are only his vocalized needs, are comprehended in the completeness of his being, and, therefore, embraced in that divine condescension.

One of the noblest sentences, indeed, ever penned by human hand was that sentence of Moses, "God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him." This says, not so much that God is anthropomorphic, as that man is *theomorphic;* not, indeed, so much so in his corporeal frame as in his nature and spirit. And the author of the Book of Wisdom explains this sentence by saying, "God made man for immortality." And herein man, unlike the animal races, has an eternity done up in his nature, a wonderful parallelism with God himself. And how has that divine sentence ennobled the thoughts and character of man through the ages of Christendom! And hence, too, the profound consistency of our Christian theism in believing that God condescends to man. It is a great *a fortiori*, that if God condescends to the voiceless needs of the infinitesimal insect, much more will he condescend to the vocal needs of the being created in the image of his own eternity.

After this anthropomorphic banter, Mr. Wakeman's first argument against prayer-fulfillment is drawn from the divine perfection. "If the laws of nature be but the order of continuous manifestations of his power, they are invariable because they must *be perfect*, for they are the action of a Perfect Being who omnisciently knew all things for all time, and had infinite power to execute all that he knew or wished. Such a being is, therefore, commonly and properly described as unchangeable, and "without a shadow of turning."

It does not follow, we reply, that, because a being is absolutely perfect, the products of his power are absolutely perfect. A created being is inferior to his creator, and is, therefore, not absolutely perfect. A created universe is not absolutely perfect, for it is inferior toi ts creator. There can, therefore, be no absolutely perfect creation. The dependence

of a living being is an imperfection. Limitation in the magnitude or amount of a being is an imperfection. Hence all finities are but relatively perfect. And that is relatively perfect which is best adapted to its end or place. And in order to the variety of a world, and to deliver it from monotony, there need be ranks and grades, and so superiorities and inferiorities; the highest superior being inferior to the Most High, and so all beneath him and dependent upon him; and, therefore, imperfect, but relatively perfect. Yet an infinitely wise being would create a universe, however necessarily imperfect, if its existence were better than its non-existence. If the alternative be between a defective universe and universal nothingness, wisdom would probably prefer the former. Wisdom would create the best possible universe. And the admission of defects might be necessary to that best possible. In this little music-box I have on my table there is a polished revolving cylinder, from whose solid circumference projects a large number of needles, standing in the most lamentable disorder. That disorder is plainly *seen* to be an imperfection. And yet every one of these projectives is so positioned as to strike upon its proper metallic key in such precisely successive order as to produce the most perfect strain of music. That is, disorder is a necessary condition to a higher order; imperfection is the condition of perfection. And that imperfection is relatively perfect, and that relative perfection is absolutely imperfect. We justify the imperfection by pointing to the high perfection it conditionates and to the more perfect system that results.

Nor does Mr. Wakeman rightly claim, that the invariability of the divine nature, without shadow of turning, prohibits an infinite variety of divine actions. The basis of all natural laws is the supreme law of reason in the divine mind, in accordance with which those laws are but *the uniform course of divine volitions*. Uniformity of law is maintained by the divine will in order that finite intelligences may be enabled to know what to expect, and *to calculate the future* and regulate their actions; a uniformity without which intelligence would be unintelligent. And of course, should a given law have finished all the purpose of its existence, and have performed its whole mission, then, by the same reason, which is the supreme law of laws, would it be changed. This would follow from the

very immutability of that reason which, in itself, is without "the shadow of turning," but which is carrying finite things through an infinite variety of turnings and changes.

But it is a mistake to suppose that a supernatural interposition, a prayer-hearing, a MIRACLE, is a *change*, violation, or suspension *of law*. It is simply *a change in the particular course of events under the law* by the interposition of a new impulse. Thus a ball is flying through the air, whose course by natural law is to gradually curve down in a given direction to the earth. But a player suddenly interposes a blow by which its course is deflected into a new direction. This is not a *change of law*, but a *change of result under law*. The new sequence is produced by the introduction of a new antecedent. And whether that new antecedent is a human or divine interposition makes no difference as to the invariability of the law. Nor is it a change, as Mr. Wakeman assumes, in the "general order," for it is contemplated by reason as within the divine programme. We know no law, science knows no law, that incapacitates Omnipotence from so interposing. The question whether such an interposition ever has taken place is not a question of science, but of historical fact. And the man who knows that no such fact has taken place in the past eternity, and none will take place in the future eternity, is simply omniscient. As laws are interposed in order that finite intelligences might be intelligent, so interpositions may most wisely take place to raise finite intelligences in thought above the finite routine into recognition, contemplation, and sympathy with the supreme intelligence. Thence are they developed and educated into a nobler nature by that Infinite, who, as already shown, is infinitely condescending to the finities and even to the infinitesimals.

The next argument of our learned friend against efficacy of prayer is from God's foreknowledge. He says: "All things must have been fore-ordained by himself, in order to be knowable by him. But if he knew and ordained the result he must be morally responsible for it; and if he is also perfect, the result ordained by him must be perfect. But it could be perfect in one order only; for there cannot be two perfect orders. Therefore the actual order must have been eternally perfect and eternally ordained, and the prayer for any change must be useless

and absurd." Our Calvinistic brethren, we reply, might concede that God must fore-ordain in order to foreknow, but we are Arminian, and hold no such conception. God's foreknowledge is but a phase of his omniscience, by which he knows all things, past, present, and future, possible or necessary. And as fore-ordination is an act, and omniscience is an attribute, of God's nature, so the act must be subsequent and the nature antecedent. That is, God must know before he ordains. And even if his fore-ordination and his omniscience are both eternal, still, in the order of necessary thought, the omniscience must be antecedent to the fore-ordination, as an eternal cause is in the order of thought and nature antecedent to its eternal effect, as the eternal Father is antecedent to the eternal Son. And that fore-ordination of a particular finite fact may be in its nature conditional upon a foreknown antecedent event. God may know that an agent can freely, unnecessitatedly choose either of several ways. And then he may know which one of the several ways which the agent is *able* to choose will be the way he *will actually* choose. God's omniscience no more compels this agent's special action than the light of the sun, falling upon his body, cramps it to a particular course. The foreknowledge adjusts itself to the choice, not the choice to the foreknowledge. And so the most perfect cosmos is the cosmos which, having a base fixed in its own material laws and substance, is the stage on which a free history is evolved and made by free agents. And the most perfect order of God and plan of the historic world is that which is finally the grand *resultant and sum total* of *free action* under divine overrule. And in the very perfection of that plan are included such sympathy between Infinity and the finities, between God and man; and such condescensions and special interpositions, and divine interferences and commands, as are wonderful; as wonderful as those condescensions we have already shown to exist in nature. And "the responsibility" for the free alternative choice in favor of evil rests, not "upon God," but upon him who, with full power for good choice instead, originated from himself the actual evil choice. For man is not a thing; far less an infinitesimal thing. As a living, intelligent being, he is of more importance than the whole material universe; for that universe might just as well be so much pure space, so

much absolute nothingness, except in so far as it contributes to the well-being of a thinking, feeling being. It results, therefore, from the perfections, and especially the immutability, of God, that alternativity and change and interposition should be embraced in his system.

Mr. Wakeman argues, above, that as perfection is one, and "there cannot be two perfect orders," so there can be but one way possible to God. Absblute perfection is, we admit, one, and "cannot be two;"and is realized in God alone. But relative perfection, approximative perfection, is a thing of degrees; and who can say that there may not be several perfects in equal degree? But even the oneness of perfection requires not one stiff procedure, one iron stereotype; for variability, possibility of substitution, itself may often be the one best and most perfect course of things.

Mr. Wakeman next raises and answers a theistic inquiry: "But it is said, may not God, in some way, adjust his fixed laws so as to effect answers to prayer much as human beings do, or are supposed to do? The answer is, that scientific laws are unvariable, and therefore always unadjustable. They cannot be adjusted by either God or man." We ask the proof that He who imposed these laws cannot withdraw, modify, or change them. A distinguished scientist, Professor Cooke, of Harvard, in a noble volume, entitled "The Religion of Chemistry," has shown with great beauty and force that the laws of nature themselves exhibit luminous proofs of having been primordially planned for the construction of a cosmos by an all-comprehensive will. Freedom of choice is a divine perfection, and so the planning will that imposed those laws can suspend or repeal them. And both that imposition and that change may, like any other divine act, be part of a still more primordial plan, and be required by divine perfection.

Next, Mr. Wakeman considers a theistic case of adjustment. "Let us," says he, "suppose that prayer was foreknown and fore-ordained by the Supreme Being as a thing to happen as a part of his government by which man would procure a benefit that God had fore-ordained thereupon to grant. Then the prayer would be useless; for the event would happen as a part of the perfect world-order, without prayer, or, if prayer were decreed to be inseparably connected with the event, then it would be

simply a part of it, a superfluous concomitant of the event, and useless, since the event would happen without it. The maker of the prayer would be only an automaton working for nothing." The case, as we understand it, is this. A storm, we will suppose, is about to happen in the natural order of elementary sequence, which will suddenly relieve a long and destructive drought. God divinely arranges so that a prayer of faith is immediately followed by the bursting of the storm. Barely this sequence would not approve itself an interposed answer. But if the prayer anticipated a variety of peculiar facts and events in the coming of the storm, those anticipations might be so special as to prove the prayer predictive. The prayer would be "useless" as to changing the special sequence; but it would be profoundly beneficent as proving the great truth we have illustrated, the divine condescension to the finite. Such was the prayer of Elijah for the storm which God promised to succeed his performance of the prayer-gauge with the priests of Baal. It was a predictive prayer of faith; and the fulfillment proclaimed that "Jehovah is" not "dead." And so the deluge of Noah may have been a natural event, and yet so concurrent with the preceding wickedness of men and the inspired anticipations of Noah as to come into the order of the supernatural, testifying Jehovah's existence and his divine retribution.

A further argument against prayer-answer is, that to affix a special result to a prayer "would be conditioning the order of events and the order of a perfect world upon the volition of an imperfect being." Have we not shown that imperfection in the world is often the condition of perfection? Surely the learned reasoner will not maintain that the world and its events are not modified by man's volitions, however imperfect. Professor G. P. Marsh shows how man's volitions have changed the face of the earth. And the reasoning is especially malapropos in the case of answered prayer; since we shall soon show reason to believe that such prayer is always inspired and guided by God himself, so that the act of the imperfect being is sure to be, if not perfect, tributary to a perfect result.

Finally, a prayer-answering God, he declares, is "the reverse of worshipful," "a limited imperfect, *quasi* human agent." Please just reverse that statement. An infinite that cannot condescend to a finite, even to an infinitesimal, is limited and

imperfect. He is not truly infinite nor truly perfect. Infinite force can run down the infinite line, *diminuendo*, of fleas. Infinite law condescends to the ultimate particle, and yet, forsooth, the power that energizes that law to the ultimate minimum cannot condescend to mortal man! Mr. Wakeman can at once see that such a limitation of the reach of *law* would be infinitely absurd. Why not equally absurd this limitation of omniscience and omnipotence?

But let us, with our learned friend, put the question to an experimental test, the "prayer-gauge." Mr. Tyndall proposed, if we rightly recollect, that there should be two hospitals, in one of which all prayer should be offered for the patients, and for the other all Christians should be prayerless. We will then know whether prayer is effective of answer and fulfillment. Mr. Wakeman tells us those scientists who proposed such contract were "vociferously accused" of "profanity and blasphemy," etc. I never heard or read those vociferous accusations; but it seems to me that, if he will for a moment contemplate the Christian idea of the Divine Being, he would candidly confess that such a performance, if not the proposition, would justly seem to Christians profoundly irreverent. Mr. Wakeman assures us that "no advocate of prayer dares to imitate Elijah" in trying such a test. Our friend is mistaken. We accept his challenge, and are ready to "imitate Elijah." But before we do so, we will make three all-important discriminations.

Prayer directly affecting an external physical thing, changing the order of physical events, we will admit to be miracle and miraculous interposition. But, *first*, note that the direct interposition of the Divine Spirit within the human *spirit* belongs to a different order. We believe that the Spirit of God can pervade the spirit of man, as the light of the morning sun pervades the atmosphere of our earth. And within that sphere there is a spiritual order of cause and effect, which, in the sense of being regular, is an order of nature. The Spirit of God, pervading the spirit of man, produces conviction of sin, of which the consequence may be repentance, and the fixed sequence of that may be faith, and the sequence of that pardon, justification, peace with God, happiness, and heaven. This, as a regular order, may be called nature, but from its elevation may be called supernatural, but scarcely miraculous. And, *second*, the

divine energy may also at will enter the lower regions of our psychological nature, with sequences that can be orderly and yet interposed. Not only the spirit, but the intellect, may be pervaded with brightening or obscuring influences, the emotions may be heaved or allayed, the springs of the will may be touched. And, *third*, and lower still, and unequivocally *miraculous*, the physiological regions may be reached, the vital forces, the corporeal energies, the vigor of courage, the fountains of health, and the issues of life. These three mysterious chambers of operations are ruled by God himself as "the hidings of his power." No scale can weigh, no rule can measure, this divine efficiency; no science can bring it into the circle of physical "correlations." The current of sequences may here be reversed at the demand of prayer, and human science be none the wiser for it. Thence may go forth the most momentous results into the world. Under this divine agency the individual fortune may be controlled, nay, national destinies may be decided, and man never know the secret springs of action. The "order of nature" may thus take either of a variety of ways, and science perceive no loss of invariability. We are now prepared for the prayer-guage.

As, however, Mr. Wakeman has specified the precedent of Elijah, as a good jurist he must accept the case as it stands on record. And the record is this: Elijah was sent expressly by Jehovah to this experiment of prayer, undertaken under prophetic impulse, with a divine promise that a miraculous rain should, after the prayer-test performed, remove the general drought. Elijah therefore *waited for a special command*, a divine authority, and a prophetic impulse. We shall do the same. We "imitate Elijah." And let it be understood that this is no quibble, for it is easy to show that, by the biblical view, it is a universal law that miracle-working is a *χάρισμα*, *charisma*, a special divine gift. And so the miracle-working prayer is itself miracle-wrought. Every miracle is thus double, internal and external. The example of Elijah in depending on special inspiration accords with the biblical law of the New Testament. Of this special faith Jesus declared in the gospels that if a mustard-seed amount were imparted for a given work, though it were moving a mountain, it could be done. An infinitesimal particle of bestowed omnipotence could achieve

its mightiest mission. In the Acts of the Apostles the power of "healing," especially, was a *charisma*, a gift. And in the epistle St. James tells us that the faith that "availeth much" is *ενεργουμένη*, *inwrought*, and quotes Elijah as a case in point.

The possession of that charismatic power is either *conscious* or *unconscious*. When *consciously* possessed and given as correlative to a certain act, that act is in full faith executed. If that act be to engage in a "prayer-gauge," then a man or a church may, as Elijah did, undertake the mission. Otherwise no man may without presumption enter into contract for the Almighty to perform a certain work. But if, on the other hand, the power for miraculous result be not *consciously* realized, then the Christian fervently prays for the externality with a cheerful "peradventure God may give" the boon, and with the underlying reserve "thy will be done," the blessed result of which prayer is to retain the human spirit in calm, resigned communion with the Divine Spirit. And the Church and the New Testament are chary of specifying external things in prayer to God. No one claims that prayer-skill can dispense with the medical profession, or that prayer-force can take the place of steam-force in running rail-cars. The most Christian of ancient pagans, Socrates, as Xenophon tells us, "prayed to the gods to give us good things, realizing that the gods best know what things are good; but he thought that those praying for gold and silver and power, or any of such things, prayed as it were for a game of chance, not knowing how it might turn out." When the parent prays for the life of his sick child, perhaps that child, if made to live, would be the curse of himself, family, and country. When a prayer is offered for a national specialty, its fulfillment may interfere with the divine administration of the affairs of nations. The specialty is unbestowed, but the reflex moral and spiritual benefit on the supplicator is immeasurable.

As an actual physiological miracle, the restoration to health by prayer must have the rarity of miracle, and require the most unequivocal proof, especially as means of convincing an unbeliever. The prayer ordinarily offered, and that should be ordinarily offered, at the sick-bed, is modest and submissive. It is ordinarily but the earnestly expressed *wish* of human sympathy, reverently addressed to God, graciously by him

accepted as such, and resulting only in benign influences upon the human feelings. Conscious communion in the devout heart with God is itself to the feeble a tranquilizing, sustaining, and restorative power. It is a supernaturalism, bringing us nearer to him, and shading imperceptibly toward miracle. And as there is something intrinsically spiritual also in the secret, life-touching, curative power of medicine, so there is a blending of the two, the supernatural and the natural. This divine communion and trust resting down upon the medicine is the so called "blessing on the means;" and I doubt not that the sick and dying believer in Christ is many a time, especially in diseases of mental and nervous nature, by this double power restored. Such a case is a supernaturalism, but not a *miracle.* The bold claim of a positive objective MIRACLE must be sustained by unequivocal proof. The deep reality of the disease, the instantaneous sequence of the cure, the completeness and permanence of the restoration, and the trustworthiness of the witnesses, must be perfectly clear. Nor are these cases of such frequency or regularity as to be calculated upon as to take place in any hospital you may select.

But we are triumphantly told that Garfield's case presents "the crucial test," "grander than that of Elijah." Not quite. The discussing parties had entered into no compact. Mr. Wakeman and his co-thinkers would never have accepted Garfield's recovery as any proof of the power of prayer, and Christians never admitted his dying as any disproof. With both sides, therefore, it was no test case.

And then, what Mr. Wakefield calls "the prayer of fifty millions" never existed. One third of the nation, at least, in deferential silence, was quite willing he should die. Two thirds of the whole never prayed, even in form. A small minority did devoutly pray; but none of that choice few possessed the divine commission, the prophetic impulse, or the charismatic power of Elijah, and none, so far as I know, ever claimed it. It was simply the earnest *wish* of a large body of our people, shaped into earnest, uninspired prayer by only the devoutest hearts. What is thereby proved? What nobody ever denied, that the united prayer of our Christian body is not sure of obtaining an external, physical miracle from God. To assert such a surety would be to claim Church control over

the physical forces of events of the world. We would be glad to be informed what Protestant authority of our day ever uttered such a claim? But all this touches not the spiritual sequences within the spirit of man, on which alone Christianity is emphatic.

Two or three points made supplementary to the argument we may, in conclusion, notice.

To the argument in behalf of a Supernatural drawn from the universality of the belief in the supernatural, Mr. Wakeman answers somewhat contemptuously. He parallels such belief, even the belief in God, with the belief in "fairies, witches," etc. But what are even those superstitions, we ask, but the unenlightened forms of the same natural belief of the Supernatural? When men's ideas are local and fragmentary, their supernaturals are so. But even then they often monotheistically believe in a *supreme* deity, though they possess not the full conception of an Infinite Being. But when expanding thought grasps firmly the realities of infinite space and limitless power, and sees the astronomic world to be a unit, the idea of an omnipresent, omnipotent Unit over the whole bases itself firmly in the human soul. To the claim that the Supernatural is a "want" of the soul, he first denies that "the general want of a thing proves its existence." My answer is, that for every constitutional primary "want" of the human soul there is the constituted supply, whether each individual obtains possession of it or not. He next affirms that the "want" is produced by the belief, and will die with it. The reverse I submit to be the fact. The belief is prompted by the instinctive "want," and established by the intuitive reason, and will live as long as the instinct does. To the appalling aspect of these his denials of God, personality and immortality, he offers the consolation of knowing "the truth." Well, the criminal under death sentence, waiting for a reprieve, has a satisfaction in at last knowing the worst of his case; but that relieves not the anguish of knowing that his doom is death. Nor, for us, does the fixed certainty of our doom diminish our horror of its endless darkness. To all that horror these sad denials surrender us. To the deep questionings of the soul, "When shall day dawn on the night of the tomb," what is the answer? Quoth the Raven, "NEVERMORE!"

Art. II.—THE EARLIEST CREED OF MANKIND.

The sacred books of Judaism and of Christianity describe the first human beings as having stood in direct personal fellowship with the personal Creator of the world, as having received instruction and commandments from him, as having at length, in consequence of disobedience, been dispossessed of Eden and subjected to a new, providential, and gracious administration devised for their salvation. They teach that the descendants of the first human pair recognized, by offerings and sacrifices, the being and claims of the Supreme God, and that for a long time—certainly till after the Flood—a line of pious patriarchs maintained in the wicked world the profession and testimony of monotheistic believers.

The Koran is pervaded by the same idea. To Mohammed, no less than to Moses and Paul, the theism of revelation was the primitive faith of mankind; polytheism and its attendant idolatry were of later origin, and traceable to spiritual blindness and unbelief. In all three of the monotheistic religions of the world, therefore, men are conceived of as commencing their history with a supernatural knowledge of the one true and living God.

In the Christian world the first noteworthy treatise expressing dissent from this view was from the pen of the English deist, David Hume. In his "Natural History of Religion," (published in 1755,) he lays down this as his first and fundamental proposition: "Polytheism was the primary Religion of Mankind."

His first argument in support of this thesis is an appeal to the evidence of post-Christian history. He puts it thus:

> It is a matter of fact, incontestable, that about 1,700 years ago all mankind were polytheists. The doubtful and skeptical principles of a few philosophers, or the theism, and that not entirely too pure, of one or two nations, form no objection worth regarding. Behold, then, the clear testimony of history. The farther we mount into antiquity the more do we find mankind plunged into polytheism. No marks, no symptoms of any more perfect religion. The most ancient records of the human race still present us with that system as the popular and established creed. The North, the South, the East, the West, give their unanimous testimony to the same fact. What can be opposed to so full an evidence?

The force of this passage consists almost exclusively in its cool positiveness of dogmatic assertion. Plainly, the condition of the majority of mankind 1,700 years ago affords no just criterion by which to judge of the condition of the race thousands of years before that. Indeed, to any believer in historic evolution of any sort, it would seem antecedently certain that the condition of men several thousand years after the commencement of their existence must be very different indeed from their primitive condition. But, furthermore, he grants that 1,700 years ago the prevalence of polytheism was, after all, not universal; there were "one or two nations" of theists, and even philosophers in other nations, who doubted the truth of polytheism. It was absurd, therefore, to talk of "the *unanimous* testimony" of North and South, East and West.

The second point urged by Hume is the improbability of the supposition that "a barbarous, necessitous animal, such as man is, on the first origin of society," a being "pressed by such numerous wants and passions," should have had either the disposition, or the capacity, or the leisure, so to study "the order and frame of the universe" as immediately to be led "into the pure principles of theism." He grants that a careful and philosophic consideration of the unity and order of the natural world is sufficient to conduct one to an assured belief in the being of one Supreme and Almighty Creator, but he says: "I can never think that this consideration could have an influence on mankind when they formed their first rude notions of religion." Assuming that the first men must necessarily have been "an ignorant multitude," he says:

> It seems certain that, according to the natural progress of human thought, the ignorant multitude must first entertain some groveling and familiar notion of superior powers before they stretch their conception to that perfect Being who bestowed order on the whole frame of nature.

The force of this argument it is difficult to see. It all rests upon two assumptions: first, the assumption that the first men were the lowest barbarians—to use his own words, "barbarous, necessitous animals;" and, secondly, the assumption that there was, apart from the philosophic study of nature, no other way in which they could have obtained a belief in the existence of the Creator. As no religionist of any age has ever admitted these assumptions, and as Hume adduces no particle of proof

for either of them, this part of his argument is surely without force.

His next and last point is the impossibility of the loss of the monotheistic faith if it had once been reached by the earliest men. He says:

> If men were at first led into the belief of one superior Being by reasoning from the frame of nature, they could never possibly leave [have left] that belief in order to embrace polytheism; but the same principles of reason which at first produced and diffused over mankind so magnificent an opinion, must be [have been] able, with greater facility, to preserve it. The first invention and proof of any doctrine is much more difficult than the supporting and retaining of it.

Here our author appears to even poorer advantage than in either of his former arguments. In the first place, as before, he ignores the possibility of supposing a knowledge of God by means of a divine self-manifestation—thus covertly misrepresenting or evading the only point in debate. In the second place, the assertion, that if the first men had attained to a pure theism, they never could have left it and become polytheists, should be compared with his own later assertions in section viii, of the same treatise, where he describes what he, himself, calls the "Flux and Reflux of Polytheism and Theism." This section opens thus:

> It is remarkable that the principles of religion have a kind of flux and reflux in the human mind, and that men have a natural tendency to rise from idolatry to theism, and to sink again from theism into idolatry.

The author then states his well-known theory of the origin of polytheism as the first form of religion, and his theory of the rise of monotheism out of polytheism. But when a people have thus reached a belief in a God possessed of "the attributes of unity and affinity, simplicity and spirituality," there comes—so he declares—a natural relapse into polytheism. The explanation of this is given in these words:

> Such refined ideas [as those of pure monotheism] being somewhat disproportioned to vulgar comprehension, remain not long in their original purity, but require to be supported by the notion of inferior mediators or subordinate agents, which interpose between mankind and their supreme deity. These demi-gods, or middle beings, partaking more of human nature, and being more familiar to us, become the chief objects of devotion. . . . But as these idolatrous religions fall every day into grosser and more vulgar corruptions, they at last destroy themselves, and by the vile

representations which they form of their duties make the tide turn again toward theism.

Thus monotheism and polytheism are, to Hume, two opposites, between which the human mind forever oscillates. This being so, it is plain that this oscillation is grounded in reason, or it is not. If it is grounded in reason, then primitive men may have reasoned their way into monotheism as their first religious faith, and still have relapsed into polytheism as the natural and rational reaction. On the other hand, if the oscillation is not grounded in reason, then, as by his own account all later religious states of mankind have been unreasonable, the *first* may have been altogether different from what Hume would have considered rational; that is, may have been a state of pure monotheism.

Such was Hume's attempted demonstration of the primitiveness of polytheism, and the whole of it.

Five years later, in 1760, De Brosses, one of Voltaire's correspondents, published his crude but noteworthy book on "The Worship of Fetiches; or, Parallel of the Ancient Religion of Egypt with the present Religion of Nigritia." This was the writer who first gave currency to the word "Fetichism," and who first postulated it as the invariable antecedent of polytheism. De Brosses, however, was a professed believer in primeval divine revelation, and he made the Hebrews an exception to his general claim that all ancient nations began with fetichism, rose thence to polytheism, and tended thence toward monotheism. In the early part of the present century, however, Auguste Comte, ignoring any primeval revelation, elevated De Brosses's generalization into an absolute law of historic development. He gave the greater acceptability and influence to it by representing this law of theological progress as only part of a yet broader social law, according to which humanity, having traversed this "theological stage" in the manner indicated, passes next through a "metaphysical" one, and finally attains the "scientific" stage of atheistic positivism.

In Germany, in 1795, Hume's opinion found an able representative in G. L. Bauer, of Altdorf, and ten years later we find Meiners, in his "Universal History of Religion," repeating and enforcing the notion of the absolute primitiveness of fetichism. The rationalistic and pantheistic tendencies of

German speculation about this time, were, of course, favorable to any new theory which discredited the biblical one, and thus it came to pass that before the middle of the present century the De Brosses theory, in its completer Comtean form, became almost universally adopted. Speaking of its prevalence, Max Müller says:

> All of us have been brought up on it. I, myself, certainly held it for a long time, and never doubted it till I became more and more startled by the fact that, while in the earliest accessible documents of religious thought we look in vain for any very clear traces of fetichism, they become more and more frequent every-where in the latter stages of religious development, and are certainly more visible in the later corruptions of the Indian religion, beginning with the Atharvana, than in the earliest hymns of the "Rig Veda." *

For many years our works on primeval history have been saturated with this idea. Even professedly Christian writers upon the history of religions, and upon Comparative Theology, have largely fallen in with the prevailing notion. As one has well said, "The very theory has become a kind of scientific fetich, though like most fetiches it seems to owe its existence to ignorance and superstition."

For some time past, however, this long dominant dogma of naturalism has been losing credit with all careful students of the world's religions, and, indeed, with the more thorough professional ethnologists. In his recent work, "The Hibbert Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion," † Max Müller, himself for a long time, as we have seen, a believer in the theory, publicly challenges its correctness. In Lecture Second, after rapidly sketching the rise and remarkable prevalence of the theory, he exposes, with much acuteness and with his usual wealth of illustrative facts, the indiscriminateness with which the term fetichism has been currently used, and the worthlessness of evidence upon which Comte and others have relied. He sets forth, respectfully, but strongly, the inadequacy of their psychological exploration of the origin of fetichism, and shows that even the West African fetich-worshipers hold at the same time other views properly polytheistic, or, in some cases, even monotheistic. Summing up his own conclusions, he says:

---

* "Origin and Growth of Religions," Lond. and N. Y., 1879, p. 58.

† Reviewed by C. P. Tiele, in "Theol. Tijschrift," for May, 1879.

The results at which we have arrived, after examining the numerous works on fetichism from the days of De Brosses to our own time, may be summed up under four heads:

First. The meaning of the word fetich has remained undefined from its first introduction, and has by most writers been so much extended that it may include almost every symbolical or imitative representation of religious objects.

Second. Among people who have a history we find that every thing which falls under the category of fetich points to historical and psychological antecedents. We are, therefore, not justified in supposing that it has been otherwise among people whose religious development happens to be unknown or inaccessible to us.

Third. There is no religion which has kept itself entirely free from fetichism.

Fourth. There is no religion which consists entirely of fetichism.*

So able an *exposé* of the short-comings of the fetichistic philosophy of the origin of religion, coming from the pen of a writer so widely and deservedly popular, cannot fail to produce in the Anglo-Saxon world of general readers and second-hand writers a profound and wholesome impression.

Perhaps the most striking defect of this work of Müller's was his failure anywhere to recognize the fact that, so far as this dogma of primitive fetichism is concerned, he was really dealing with an issue which in advanced circles was already dead. Ten or fifteen years earlier his polemic would have done many times the good it can now. During this period a decided change has taken place. There remained a decade or two ago a further step, and but one further step, for the advocates of the naturalistic view of the origin of religion to take. Hume had made polytheism the primitive faith; Comte thought to go back of this, and to postulate a still more rudimentary form as antedating polytheism. It remained to go back of fetichism and predicate of the first men *absolute atheism*. This, various recent authors have done, prominent among whom, in England, is Sir John Lubbock. In chapter iv of his work, miscalled "The Origin of Civilization, and the Primitive Condition of Man," † he classifies "the first great stages of religious thought" as follows:

First. *Atheism;* "understanding by this term not a denial of

* "Origin and Growth of Religion," p. 115.

† The first edition was published in 1870.

the existence of a deity, but an absence of any definite ideas on the subject."

Second. *Fetichism.* In the state of primeval atheism men were "not without a belief in invisible beings." They especially believed in human shadows, ghosts, and the people seen in dreams, etc., though these spirits were not conceived of as immortal, or as possessing any supernatural powers. They were feared only because they were supposed to have power and disposition to inflict disease or otherwise injure men yet in the flesh. Now, inasmuch as it was believed that, by means of the fetich, these evil spirits could be controlled and coerced to the will of the worshiper, fetichism, viewed in its relation to religious development, is pronounced by Lubbock "a decided step in advance." Viewed in itself, "it is mere witchcraft."

Third. *Totemism*, or Nature-worship. This our author nowhere clearly distinguishes from fetichism. In this stage of religious progress—

> The savage does not abandon his belief in fetichism, from which, indeed, no race of men has yet entirely freed itself, but he superinduces on it a belief in beings of a higher and less material nature. In this stage every thing may be worshiped — trees, stones, rivers, mountains, the heavenly bodies, plants, and animals.

Fourth. *Shamanism.* "As Totemism overlies Fetichism, so does Shamanism overlie Totemism." Here the gods are conceived of as far more "powerful than men," as "of a different nature," as residing far away, and as "accessible only to the Shamans," who are "occasionally honored by the presence of the deities, or are allowed to visit the heavenly regions." This in its turn is pronounced "a considerable advance" over the preceding stage of religious thought.

Fifth. *Idolatry*, or Anthropomorphism. Here "the gods take still more completely the nature of men, being, however, more powerful. They are still amenable to persuasion; they are a part of nature, and not creators. They are represented by images or idols."

Sixth. To the sixth stage no name is given; but it is described as one in which "the deity is regarded as the author, not merely a part, of nature. He becomes for the first time a really supernatural being."

Seventh. In this last and highest stage, which he also leaves

unchristened, morality becomes "for the first time associated with religion." *

We will not stop to criticise in detail this extremely confused and ill-named classification, or the assumptions on which it rests. Its most characteristic feature is its postulation of universal primitive atheism as antedating every form of religious development in our race. So far as he rests this dogma, either upon the affirmed absence of all religious beliefs and usages among the lowest savages of to-day, or upon the principle that the religious conceptions of a people are always in exact proportion to its degree of civilization, his refutation quickly began. The next year after the publication of his work, in a learned treatise on "Primitive Culture," E. B. Tylor challenged several of Lubbock's authorities for the statement that non-religious tribes have been found, while in his new work on "The Human Species," 1879, the learned and able Professor of Anthropology in the Paris Museum of Natural History, Quatrefages, went yet further, not only maintaining, with Tylor, that no atheistic tribe of savages has yet been discovered, but also expressly denying the proposition that elevation of religious conceptions invariably corresponds to the elevation of a people in the scale of general civilization or knowledge of the arts. The fact that these objections to the hypothesis of primitive atheism came, not from theologians, but from scientific men—from fellow-students in the fields of anthropology and ethnology—gave them, with many, all the greater weight. The careful reader, however, cannot fail to see that the only difference between Lubbock and some of his critics is merely one of name and not of thing—that the alleged primitive state which he calls atheistic exactly corresponds to what Tylor and Darwin would describe as the earliest form of animistic religion, and to what Herbert Spencer would call the first rudimentary beginnings of ghost and ancestor worship. Nor can we fail to see that the consistent Darwinian evolutionist must place the beginnings of human history so near the plane of the brute-life as to make it almost certain that its first stage was truly non-theistic, if not, indeed, altogether non-religious.

Precisely at this point notice should be taken of the elaborate work of Otto Caspari, of Heidelberg, entitled "*Die Urgeschichte*

* Chaps. iv–vi.

der Menschheit, mit Rücksicht auf die natürliche Entwickelung des frühesten Geisteslebens," ("The Primitive History of Mankind, with Respect to the Natural Evolution of the Earliest Spiritual Life.") This two-volumed treatise was issued at Leipsic in 1872, and reached a second edition in 1877. A very large portion of it is devoted to the exposition of the author's view of the origin and natural evolution of religion in the early history of the race. This view is characterized by an originality and elaborated with an ingenuity which render the book as fascinating to the student as the most absorbing romance. The author is a pure and professed evolutionist, but instead of attempting to solve his problem with Lyell and Broca from the data of Paleontology, or with Darwin and Häckel from the data of Zoology, or with Huxley and Bastian from the data of Biology, or with Müller and Noiré from the data of Philology, or with Prichard and Peschel from the data of Ethnology, or with Tylor and Lubbock from the data of Culture-History, or with Waitz and Topinard from the data of General Anthropology, he approaches it and grapples with it as a problem for that higher and broader science to which all of the above are tributary—the science to which its German originators have given the name, *Völker-psychologie*, (Ethnic or Anthropic Psychology.) He cannot consider the problem solved until, beginning with the psychological facts of brute-life, we are able to represent to ourselves the successive steps and stages by which the originally animal mind slowly evolved all the spiritual and religious conceptions, emotions, habits, and ideals of the historic and actual human race. His own attempt to do this is not free from arbitrary assumptions or inconsistencies, but, as a whole, it is a marvel of subtile analysis and constructive ability. In contrast with it the expositions of Hume and Lubbock appear as clumsy and grotesque as the early theories of geology, described in Goldsmith's "Book of Nature," now look to the modern student.

One of the oldest of the antisupernaturalist explanations of the origin of religion is that which ascribes it to the ignorant and superstitious fears of earliest men.

"Primus in orbe deos fecit timor,"

wrote Petronius, and Lucretius's fuller exposition of the same notion is familiar. No such explanation satisfies Caspari. He

cannot conceive how fear could ever become that compound of reverence and love which is of the essence of religion. Fear simply prompts the brute to shun, as far as may be, the object feared. Equally unsatisfactory is the notion that the heavenly bodies and the sublimer phenomena of nature inspired the awe and curious questionings out of which religion could have grown. The primitive man, like the anthropoid brute, took no notice of the remote and lofty. Nothing had interest for him save that which was perceived to be vitally related to him in the struggle for existence. The range of his conceptions and of his sympathies was limited to the objects which were his allies or his enemies in this perpetual battle. Religion, therefore, is not to be traced to any inworking of nature or of natural objects upon the human mind. It had a deeper and yet more obvious genesis in natural human relationships. The first and root-form of all piety was filial piety. The first object of truly religious regard was *the parent*. This reverential and affectionate regard of the consciously ignorant, weak, and dependent child for the indefinitely wise, strong, and helpful father or mother is essentially religious. At an extremely early date it must have become extended from the parent to the all-defending and all-regulating tribal chieftain, and to the aged and experienced counselors of the rude primeval communities. The natural tendency of uncivilized men to gesture-language must have produced habitual forms of rendering homage—the germ of which we may observe in the homage paid by the bees to their queen—and thus parents, chieftains, and sages were the first objects of religious reverence and homage among men. As yet men had no conceptions of nature as a whole, no intellectual interest in stars or trees or animals, no mental provocation to worship any thing else than "*the ethically exalted*," as it appeared in the narrow circle of the family and tribal life. There was no thought of an unseen world, no idea of souls, no proper conception even of death. The dead man was supposed to be simply asleep, or in a long swoon. Being self-evidently helpless for the present, like a sick member of the family, he called out natural pity and care. Food and drink were placed in readiness against his re-awakening. If he had to be left behind, he was put in a cave to protect him against wild beasts, and his weapons were left for his use.

On the basis of this *naïve* conception of things the rise of animal worship first becomes conceivable. The beast which has devoured a man, living or dead, is now as much man as beast. The man has not ceased to be, he has simply blended his life in that of the beast, and become a "half-beast." The ferocity of the new compound is easily mistaken for an angry wish on the part of the late man to take vengeance on his relatives or associates for not having more effectually protected him from the devouring animal. But if the man-beast is human enough to remember and avenge such real or supposed neglects on the part of his late friends, he must be human enough to recognize and appreciate any well-meant attempts to appease his anger and propitiate his favor. Hence a natural basis, not for universal animal worship, but for the worship of the more common carnivora, and these Caspari endeavors to show were the first that attained such distinction.

Here, also, is found the origin of Cannibalism. A man has killed his foe. If he leaves him merely dead, he will some time come to life again as bad as ever. If haply a wild beast first come and devour him, he will then become a ferocious and malevolent "man-beast"—a worse enemy than ever. There is no way of making the victory final and secure, except by eating him up one's self. Then the life and valor of the slain becomes the life and valor to the slayer. Even the eating of others than foes becomes in this way intelligible. As the Fan Negroes are said to eat—"with a certain tenderness"—the corpses of their wives and children, so the primitive man, seeking the safest possible place for the body of his dead friend, may have thought it a far friendlier act to eat him up than to leave him to take his chances at the hand of worms under-ground, or beasts of prey above it. Between the two motives, the desire to appropriate the vital forces of the foe and the wish to do the best possible thing for the unwakable friend, our author thinks that anthropophagy became in the first age of the world almost universal. The very piety of the surviving for the dead contributed to the dissemination of the revolting custom.

Our limits will not permit an equally full account of the remaining steps by which religion has become what it has been and is in the world. Suffice to say that possible millenniums from the beginning of human history toward the end of the

"Stone Age," there occurred the greatest revolution in human thought and belief and life which the race has yet witnessed. This was brought about by the rise and adoption of the belief that trees and men and beasts—in fine, all natural objects—are possessed of invisible, impalpable, vital principles—souls. That which evoked and supported this strange, new notion was a discovery which, estimated by the breadth and profoundness of its influence, must be placed at the head of all others: the discovery, namely, of the art of kindling fire. This mysterious and novel power of evoking what seemed a bright and living being from the realm of the invisible, by means of the "fire-drill," half bewildered even the priestly caste, in whose hands the awful secret lay. Their attempts to use it led to Shamanism and a sincere magic. By means of the observed vital heat of living things, and the coldness of the dead, the new element was quickly identified with the inner essence of life itself, and the new art the more commended to universal attention by means of its beneficent applications in the hands of the Flamens or Fire-priests to the purposes of heating. The same identification of heat and life soon associated phallus and fire-drill, and introduced the strange and apparently monstrous aberration of Phallic worship. Under these new ideas it was only natural that sun and star and lightning flash should come to have a new significance for man, and make their impress on religion. Animal worship was profoundly modified in ways ingeniously set forth. The simple oblations of the earlier period give place to sacrifice to fire, and to the heavenly bodies. So strong is the desire to become transformed into white, flaming spirits, and to be joined to the supernal fellowship of such, that men bring themselves as offerings, and seek transfiguration in the holy altar flames. Hence human sacrifices; hence also incremation of the dead. In time, the idea of the soul takes on greater and greater definiteness; so also the idea of the immaterial supersensual gods. The long-continued stimulation of the imagination renders myth-constructions possible. Some of the great priesthoods of history invent hieroglyphic and alphabetic writing, and in time there naturally follow sacred books, cosmogonies, codes of religious laws, etc., etc. The magic wand of the first fire-bringer has at last created a spiritual and unseen counterpart to the world which is seen.

In this enchanted world we live to-day, the lowest of us showing our faith by superstitious fetichism, the highest of us by attempts at a purely spiritual worship. That highest Christian conception, "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all," is simply the culmination of a mode of thinking which started ages ago with the spark which some savage prehistoric flint-chipper struck out of the flinty stone.

The brevity of this sketch of Caspari's theory renders it impossible to do full justice to the skill and plausibility with which he has elaborated it. Still less have we time for that detailed review which would be needed were we to undertake a refutation of the scheme in part or whole.

In striking opposition to the theory of Caspari stands that of *Jules Baissac*, elaborated in his "*Origines de la Religion.*" * He too begins with primitive animality, and proposes to trace the rise and natural evolution of religion from that far-off starting-point of the human race. But, instead of magnifying the initial influence of a pure domestic life in Caspari's truly German method, Baissac—in a manner characteristically French, shall we say?—starts with a deification of mere maternity, conceived of as self-originating and self-sufficing. This form of religion prevailed during the remote period anterior to the time when it was discovered that males had any participation in the procreation of the species. The religious symbols of that far-off age were les élévations et tumescences terrestres, naturelles ou artificielles, et les cavités sonterraines; les tumescences comme image du sein maternel en état de pregnation et les profondeurs et cavités comme ventre sacré de la divine mère. De là le culte des ballons ou montagnes à croupe arrondie; de là le symbolisme des tumuli, des pyramides, des grottes, des puits, des labyrinthes, des dolmens. In this period all motherhood is divine, and all life and change in nature mentally represented as a spontaneous and exclusively female conceiving and bringing forth.

In the second period, which is still anterior to the idea of marriage, and to the establishment of the idea of personal property or individual rights, the function of the male principle has been discovered; and now Nature, the divine mother, is conceived of as analogous to a woman of the period, a mother

* Paris, 2 tomes, 1877.

fecundated only by male energy, but by male energy from any quarter. To use Baissac's own terms, she is a prostituée divine ayant son symbole dans la Terre ouverte à tous les germes.*

In the third period the two principles are brought into a relation of equality, and now the divine becomes hermaphrodite.

In the fourth the male principle is given priority, the religious symbols of maternity give place to the phallic symbols, the institutions of marriage and property arise, the power of atmospheric and celestial divinities begins to supersede that of earth-spirits. The fifth stage is marked by the entire predominance of these celestial divinities and the definite rejection of the ancient chthonian and subterranean powers. In the sixth comes the final separation of the Heaven and the Earth, the idea of creation and the idea of an almighty and transcendent Creator of all things.

The manner in which the author elaborates this savory interpretation of the history and symbolism of religion, through two octavo volumes of 300 pages each, is as ingenious as it is disgusting.

The best refutation of whatever is wrong in all these new evolutional conceptions of primordial religion will be found, not in a blind and indiscriminate polemic against them *en masse*, but in showing how every departure from the traditional conception involves the careful thinker in perplexing if not insoluble problems, and how easily all the real facts on which these proposed departures are based can be arrayed in support of the traditional conception. To this task we turn.

First, then, according to Genesis, the earliest representatives of the human race begun their existence in Paradise unclad, unhoused, and possessed of none of the outward and visible signs of what is called civilization. Had Mr. Lubbock been permitted at the time to visit the spot, he would have seen—so far as Moses suggests—no printing-press, no power-loom, perhaps not even a "fire-drill" or flint "arrow-head." He would have seen no god, no Miltonic guard of angels, no Eden gates, *no temple nor altar*. He would only have noticed, in the luxuriant tropical landscape, a wealth of graceful animal forms, rising in manifold gradations, and culminating in two fair human figures. He would doubtless have gone his

* Page 131.

way and reported at the next meeting of the Anthropological Society the discovery of a new Otaheite, whose naked and artless inhabitants were evidently at the bottom of the scale as respects "culture," and in the sub-fetichistic, "atheistic stage" as respects religion. So doing, he would have committed no greater blunder than many of his favorite reporters have made in describing such people as the Andaman Islanders.*

According to the old conception, no less than according to the new, the arts were only gradually developed. Men were destitute of the art of metal-working and of all to which that was essential until the days of Tubal Cain. Musical instruments there were none, until invented by Jubal. Every thing in Sacred Scripture indicates the kind of social and industrial progress for which, in connection with the beginnings of human society, one would naturally look.

So far, then, the believer in Sacred History has no occasion whatever to disagree with the believer in Natural History. Häckel and Peschel and Caspari hold, with Moses, to the monogenesis of the race, and even place their imaginary "Lemuria" just under the northern portion of the Indian Ocean, hard by one of the traditional seats of Eden. Their account of man's migrations from that center, and of his primeval destitution of the arts, conflict with no fact recorded in Holy Scripture. Neither party can tell precisely how long the period antecedent to the rise of the first great historic civilizations of Asia, Egypt, and Greece lasted, and neither can tell how long ago it terminated, so that even in their confessed ignorances both are in accord.

But, secondly, the believer in Sacred History, Hebrew or Ethnic, cannot accept the eagerly advocated notion that the intellectual condition of the earliest men was not higher than that of the lowest savages of to-day. Ignorant of many things those earliest generations must have been, but it is equally certain that they must have been above the line which separates stationary or retrograding peoples from progressive ones. They were men capable of investigating the powers and laws of nature, of originating arts absolutely new in the history of the

* For the complete vindication of this statement, see Sir Henry Sumner Maine, "Early Law and Custom," London, 1883. pp. 229-231; Quatrefages, "The Human Species," N. Y., 1879, chap. xxxv; and especially Roskoff, "*Das Religionswesen der rohesten Naturvölker*," Leipsic, 1880.

world, and of making successive inventions which revolutionized the social state.

With this representation we should expect the Darwinian on sober second thought to agree. For it is a well-known fact that our lowest savages are dying out, while the men who peopled the world in accordance with the law of the survival of the fittest, at a period in the earth's history when, in important respects, according to Darwin, the environment was less favorable to the human struggle for existence than now—must have been superior to these degenerating and vanishing tribes. And as all evolutionists, in enumerating the qualities which win in the struggle for existence, lay great stress upon superior intellectual endowments, it is only a natural inference that the native intelligence of the earliest men was at least superior to that of the lowest modern savage. Turning to the writers in question we find our antecedent expectations confirmed. Thus Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his "Principles of Sociology," expresses himself as follows:

> There are sundry reasons for suspecting that existing men of the lowest types, forming social groups of the simplest kinds, do not exemplify men as they originally were. Probably most of them, if not all of them, had ancestors in higher states, and among their beliefs remain some which were evolved during those higher states. . . . There is inadequate warrant for the notion that the lowest savagery has always been as low as it is now. . . . That supplanting of race by race, and thrusting into corners such inferior races as are not exterminated which is now going on so actively, and which has been going on from the earliest recorded times, must have been ever going on. And the implication is that remnants of inferior races, taking refuge in inclement, barren, and otherwise unfit regions, have retrograded.*

In like manner Darwin himself conceives of the first men as capable of rising in thought above the knowledge furnished by the senses, *as able to represent to themselves the unseen and spiritual.* And he expressly calls their mental faculties "high," saying: "The same high mental faculties which first led men to believe in unseen spiritual agencies, then in fetichism, polytheism, and ultimately in monotheism, would infallibly lead him, so long as his reasoning powers remained poorly developed, to various strange superstitions and customs." † Thus Darwin

* "Principles of Sociology," pp. 106–109.

† "Descent of Man, vol. i, p. 66.

justly considers the character of the very aberrations of the human intellect in its infantile stage a striking proof of the loftiness of its powers.

Lubbock ascribes to the earliest men a like ability to conceive of the supersensual, and to govern themselves largely by ideals. Though sometimes speaking of the primitive generations as in a state of "utter barbarism," or as having been "no more advanced than the lowest savages of to-day," this seems to occur only by inadvertence, for in the later editions of his already quoted work on "The Origin of Civilization," (page 483,) he expressly admits and asserts that he does not regard cannibals as representatives of the first men.* On the same page he says: "It may be as well to state emphatically that all brutal customs are not, in my opinion, primeval. Human sacrifices, for instance, were, I think, certainly not so."

Caspari also affirms that the social state of the North American Indians and of the Australians is not primitive, but a result of degeneration. He says: "We know a succession of such tribes of which, in fact, only *ausgeartete verkommene Banden und staatliche Splitter* remain in existence, who, wild and savage, wander about in the primitive forests miserably to perish." †

Tylor takes the same general ground, maintaining that the best representatives of primitive men are not the lowest but "the higher" of the uncivilized races. Thus he says:

> In a study of the native myths of the world it is hardly practicable to start from the conceptions of the very lowest human tribes and to work upward from thence to fictions of higher growth; partly because our information is meager as to the beliefs of these shy and seldom quite intelligible folk, and partly because the legends they possess have not reached that artistic and systematic shape which they attain to among races next higher in the scale. It, therefore, answers better to take as a foundation the mythology of the North American Indians, the South Sea Islanders,

* Let us hope that it is by a like inadvertence merely that Professor Sayce speaks of "the savage tribes of the modern world, and *the still more savage* tribes among whom the languages of the earth took their start."—*Introduction to the Science of Language*, vol. ii, p. 31. Compare p. 269, where speaking of the mythopœic man, whom he considers a considerable advance on the primitive savage, the professor says: "He had not yet learned to distinguish between the lifeless and the living;" "he had not yet realized that might existed which his senses could not perceive."

† Vol. i, p. 113.

and other high savage tribes *who best represent in modern times the early mythological period of human history.**

In chapter ii of the same work he presents the evidence that many of the very lowest tribes of the modern world have become what they are by degeneration.

But, thirdly, if the best representatives of the first men must be sought, not among the lowest, but rather among the higher, of the uncivilized peoples, then surely we are justified in rejecting the notion of all those writers who, since the time of De Brosses and Comte, have maintained that primitive men personified and vitalized and fetichised all natural objects about them.

On this point the author of the "Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy" is less clear-sighted than his master. Boldly and ably as he criticises Comte in some other particulars, in this Mr. Fiske surrenders to him wholly. He says: "We may safely assert, with Comte, that the earliest attitude assumed by the mind in interpreting nature was a fetichistic attitude." † Herbert Spencer, however, recognizing the fact that the lower mammals, birds, and even insects, are able to distinguish animate from inanimate objects, and that to deny this capacity to the first men would be to make them less and lower than animals, commits himself unreservedly to the view in harmony with that of the biblical record. Quoting the stock examples of savages who, on first seeing a watch or a compass, imagined that it was alive, he shows the naturalness of the mistake, and very properly says:

> We must exclude these mistakes made in classing things which advanced arts have made to simulate living things; since such things mislead the primitive man in ways unlike those in which he can be misled by the natural objects about him. Limiting ourselves to his conceptions of these natural objects, we cannot but conclude that his classification of them into animate and inanimate is substantially correct. Concluding this, we are obliged to diverge at the outset from certain interpretations currently given of his superstitions. The assumption, tacit or avowed, that the primitive man tends to ascribe life to things which are not living is clearly an untenable assumption. Consciousness of the difference between the two, growing ever more definite as intelligence evolves, must be in him more definite than in all lower creatures. To suppose that without cause he begins to confound them, is to suppose the process of evolution inverted. ‡

* "Primitive Culture," vol. i, p. 321.. † Vol. i, p. 178, *et passim.*

‡ "Principles of Sociology," pp. 143, 144.

This writer, therefore, whom Darwin in one passage calls "our great philosopher," explicitly rejects the dogma of the primitiveness and universality of animism and fetichism among the earliest men. According to him animistic and fetichistic beliefs were not "primary beliefs," they were errors into which "the primitive man was betrayed during his early attempts to understand the surrounding world." "The primitive man no more tends to confound animate with inanimate than inferior creatures do." (P. 146.)

Caspari, too, as we have seen, denies to fetichism a primitive character. Ascribing its rise to the new ideas which the discovery of the art of fire-kindling produced, he makes the worship of "the morally exalted," (*des sittlich Erhabenen,*) represented by the personal father, the tribal chieftain, and the deceased ancestor far older, possibly thousands of years older, than any worship of fetiches. With Lubbock there is no moral element in religion until it reaches its last and highest stage. With Caspari, on the contrary, religion is essentially moral in its first emergence, and has from the first moment of its existence an actual and relatively worthy personal object. This is a prodigious scientific advance from the positions of Hume, Comte, Lubbock, and all their followers, and by postulating a high moral nature and moral life at the very beginnings of human history, it renders the biblical conception of those beginnings, not only conceivable, but even antecedently probable.

Fourthly, the Bible and the sacred traditions of nearly all peoples represent monogamy as the first form of marriage, ascribing all deviations from it to the ungoverned selfish passions of men. This view, Lubbock and the writers whom he has followed, M'Lennan and Morgan, emphatically reject. These theorists claim that among the first men the late Oneida Community system of "complex marriage," or, as Lubbock calls it, "communal marriage," universally obtained. The appropriateness of the term *marriage* is very far from clear. The first communities were mere herds, in which all the women were "wives" to all the men. In M'Lennan's opinion "the next stage was that form of polyandry in which brothers had their wives in common; afterward came that of the *levirate*, that is, the system under which, when an elder brother died, his second brother married the widow, and so on with the others

in succession. Thence he considered that some tribes branched off into endogamy, others into exogamy; that is to say, some forbade marriage out of, others within, the tribe. If either of these two systems was older than the other, he considers that exogamy must have been the more ancient. Exogamy was based on infanticide, and led to the practice of marriage by capture. Lubbock, on the contrary, believes that the communal marriage, which he assumes to have been the primitive form, "was gradually superseded by individual marriage founded on capture, and that this led, firstly, to exogamy, and then to female infanticide, thus reversing Mr. M'Lennan's order of sequence. Endogamy and regulated polyandry, though frequent," he says, "I regard as exceptional, and as not entering into the normal progress of development." * Still different is the theory of Bachofen, set forth in his work entitled "*Das Mutterrecht.*" Assuming sexual promiscuity as the primordial state, he considers that under this system the women—instead of being rendered more and more debauched and corrupted by the practice, as we might suppose—became, on the contrary, in process of time so refined, that after a season they felt shocked and scandalized by the beastly state of things, revolted against it, and established a system of marriage with female supremacy, the husband being subject to the wife, property and descent being required to follow the female line, and women enjoying the principal share of political power.

Gradually, however, the more spiritual ideas associated with fatherhood prevailed over the more material ideas associated with motherhood. The father came to be considered the real author of life to the offspring, the mother a mere nurse, property and descent were traced in the male line, sun-worship superseded moon-worship, men absorbed all political power—in a word, as primitive "Hetairismus" was followed by the "Mother-law" system, so this now gave way to the modern social state.

The chief evolutionist authorities disagreeing so widely on this point, it is surely proper to look further. So doing, we find a number of at least equally respectable, scientific, and speculative representatives of the evolutional school, who expressly question, if they do not openly reject, the dogma of

* "Origin of Civilization," pp. 94, 95.

universal sexual promiscuity as the primeval social state. Thus Herbert Spencer argues through many pages of his "Principles of Sociology" against M'Lennan, claiming that monogamy must be conceived of as going back to the beginning. However unsettled social and sexual relations then were, "promiscuity," he affirms, "was checked by the establishment of individual connections prompted by men's likings, and maintained against other men by force." (P. 665.) Again he says: "The impulses which lead primitive men to monopolize other objects of value must lead them to monopolize women." (P. 664.) And again: "Monogamy dates back as far as any other marital relation." (P. 698.) Darwin takes substantially the same view, positively discrediting the alleged sexual promiscuity of the earliest communities.*

In like manner another of the latest of English writers on this subject, James A. Farrer, in his book entitled "Primitive Manners and Customs,"† emphatically rejects the notion that a brutal and forcible bride-capturing was ever universal, and denies that the customs relied upon by M'Lennan and others to prove its prevalence are to be viewed as a survival of such a custom. As to the absolutely first form of marriage he does not express an opinion, but the theory of primitive monogamy would better agree with his general representation than any other. The same may be said of Caspari, who, though he does not expressly postulate the priority of monogamy, yet ascribes to filial piety a rôle in the first origination of religion which seems to necessitate such a postulate.‡ So Mr. John Fiske's suggestion, that the transition from the anthropoid animals to truly human beings was probably effected by the prolongation of infancy and of parental care incident to the slower evolution of a highly complex organism, and, by the family life thus necessitated and brought about, is more harmonious with the doctrine of primitive monogamy than with any other. It would not be surprising, therefore, if this class of considerations, which we meet again in Noiré's theory of the origin of language, should gradually lead to such a reconstruction of Darwinian sociology as will postulate monogamy as the one and only form of sexual relation by virtue of which man could have

* "Descent of Man," vol. ii, pp. 362–367. † London, 1879.

‡ See vol. i, pp. 322, 358, 367.

arisen out of the lower and preceding animal orders. Mr. Spencer calls Mr. Fiske's suggestion "an important" one, and he explains it in a note appended to a significant declaration respecting the biological and sociological value of monogamy. (P. 630.) Elsewhere, after stating that "Irregular relations of the sexes are at variance with the welfare of the society, of the young and of the adults," and after ascribing the gradual dying out of the Andamanese to their promiscuity of sexual relation,* he says: "We may infer that the progeny of such unions (as had a degree of exclusiveness and durability) were more likely to be reared and more likely to be vigorous." (P. 669.) Again, a page or two later, he uses this language: "As under ordinary conditions the rearing of more numerous and stronger offspring must have been favored by more regular sexual relations, there must on the average have been a tendency for those societies most characterized by promiscuity to disappear before those less characterized by it." (P. 671.) But Spencer himself must grant that in the earliest ages, upon the whole, the race multiplied and spread from generation to generation, so that we must at least conclude from his own declaration that the approximately monogamous societies and unions were more numerous than the approximately promiscuous ones.

Fifthly, the Bible represents the earliest men as capable of entertaining the conception of a supreme Divine Being, the Maker of the heavens and earth, the Creator and rightful Lord of men. It represents them as capable of realizing the moral obligation of obedience to the Creator, and as possessed of freedom to obey or to refuse. It gives us to understand that as a matter of fact a few, then as now, were faithful to their light and to their convictions of duty, while the greater part lived in conscious violation of the promptings of their own consciences. As a natural consequence immoralities multiplied; these demoralized and brutalized those who practiced them. Then demoralized and brutalized parents were followed by children less well instructed and less well endowed than they themselves had been, and so despite exceptional men and exceptional

* Mr. E. H. Man's recent paper on the Andaman Islanders ("The Journal of the Anthropological Institute," vol. xii, i, 69, and ii, 13) denies the alleged sexual promiscuity, and illustrates the worthlessness of much of the evidence on which popular ethnographers rely.

families who were more faithful to conscience, the general demoralization went on. The song of Lamech (Gen. iv, 23, 24) is the song of a true savage, though of one who has known the law of right and duty. One can hardly read it without imagining it first sung in a kind of domestic war-dance in the hut of its polygamous author. He glories in his homicides, and evidently belongs to those who with savage lust and brutality "took them wives of all which they chose." He was a representative of his Cainite kindred. By the mass of these, and those who intermarried with them, the Father and Lord of all creatures was ignored and gradually misconceived and, at last, superseded by creations of man's own disordered mind and heart, until the pure primitive religion of the righteous patriarchs became a false worship as irrational and immoral as the mass of those who gave themselves to its loathsome and cruel practices. With some populations this abnormal and immoral evolution proceeded to thoroughly unnatural and self-destructive results, such as religious prostitution, sodomy, human sacrifices, cannibalism, etc. On the other hand, then as now, fidelity to truth and goodness led its possessor to larger knowledge and to higher spiritual experiences. Then, as ever, the principle held good, "To him that hath shall be given." Hence alongside and within and above the historic evolution of a large portion of the race from evil to evil, there was another evolution of a smaller but more vital portion from good to good. If Satan's kingdom steadily unfolded, so did also the kingdom of God. And while the one was in the direction of spiritual and physical degeneration and death, the other was in the direction of life and ultimate spiritual ascendency. Both of these partial or special evolutions were within and part of the universal evolution of the race under its pre-established nature and conditions, one of which fundamental conditions is its immanency in the Divine. Such is the picture presented us by all the monotheistic religions of the world, and it is substantially confirmed by most of the ancient traditions of the human race.

Now in all this there is nothing inconsistent with any well-established facts or principles of science. Some authorities which Lubbock himself quotes prove, not only that uncivilized tribes are capable of entertaining the theistic conception of the

world, but also that not a few of them when first found actually possessed remarkably high and pure conceptions of the Supreme Spirit and of man's relation to him. Thus he cites Livingstone as saying that "The uncontaminated African believes that the Great Spirit lives above the stars." In trying to prove the absence of prayer among certain savages, he admits witnesses who show that the Esquimos, the North American Indians, and the Caribs believed in the existence of a Supreme Spirit, the "Master of Life." He even quotes the following objection to prayer made by Tomochichi, the chief of the Yamacraws, to General Oglethorpe, to wit: "That the asking of any particular blessing looked to him like directing God; and if so, that it must be a very wicked thing. That for his part he thought every thing that happened in the world was as it should be; that God of himself would do for every one what was consistent with the good of the whole, and that our duty to him was to be content with whatever happened in general, and thankful for all the good that happened in particular." What civilized religionist, what purest monotheist, ever apprehended or expressed this theological problem more clearly than this Indian chief? Lubbock quotes another author as saying that the Caribs considered the Great Spirit as endowed with so great goodness that he does not take revenge even on his enemies.*

So Mr. Tylor allows not only that most barbarians are able to conceive of a Creator, but also that they actually believe in one. He says:

"Races of North and South America, of Africa, of Polynesia, recognizing a number of great deities, are usually and reasonably considered polytheists, yet their acknowledgment of a Supreme Creator would entitle them at the same time to the name of monotheists," if belief in a Supreme Deity, held to be the creator of the world and chief of the spiritual hierarchy, were the sufficient criterion of monotheism. "High above the doctrine of souls, of divine manes, of local nature-spirits, of the great deities of class and element, there are to be discerned in savage theology, shadowings quaint or majestic of the conception of a Supreme Deity." †

He illustrates the prevalence of this conception by facts related of barbarous peoples in almost every quarter of the globe. Speaking of the remarkable clearness of this idea and belief

* "Origin of Civilization," pp. 374, 375.

† "Primitive Culture," vol. ii, p. 332.

among the New Zealanders, the Hawaiians, the Tongans, Samoans and other representatives of the Polynesian race, he says:

> Students of the science of religion who hold polytheism to be but the misdevelopment of a primal idea of divine unity, which in spite of corruption continues to pervade it, might well choose this South Sea Island divinity as their aptest illustration from the savage world.

He quotes Moerenhout as saying:

> Taaroa is their supreme or, rather, only God; for all the others, as in other known polytheisms, seem scarcely more than sensible figures and images of the infinite attributes united in his divine person.

He adds the following sublime native description of this supreme God, (p. 345:)

> He was; Taaroa was his name; he abode in the void. No earth, no sky, no men. Taaroa calls, but naught answers; and alone existing he became the universe.

Though an outspoken opponent of the theory that polytheism arose from moral and spiritual degeneration, his own facts are so strong that, for the explanation of some of them, he is constrained to resort to it. Speaking of the "conceptions of the Supreme Deity in the savage and barbaric world," he says, "The degeneration theory may claim such beliefs as mutilated and perverted remnants of higher religions, in some instances, no doubt, with justice."

That a religion originally good and pure may degenerate and become corrupt is conceded even by Lubbock. At the close of his sketch of "the lowest intellectual stages through which religion has passed," he uses this significant language:

> I have stopped short sooner perhaps than I should otherwise have done, because the worship of personified principles, such as Fear, Love, Hope, etc., could not have been treated apart from that of the *Phallus*, or *Lingam*, with which it was so intimately associated in Greece, India, Mexico, and elsewhere; and which, though at first modest and pure—as all religions are in their origin—led to such abominable practices, that it is one of the most painful chapters in human history.*

Reading this the disciple of history simply asks: If men could so corrupt the originally modest and pure worship of Aphrodite, why not also the originally pure worship of Jehovah?

* "Origin of Civilization," p. 350.

Summing up, then, we see: 1. That, in rejecting the historical conception of the primeval religious belief of mankind, Hume took up a position which none of his own successors consider as at all tenable.

2. The further these successors have carried their revolt against history, the more have they become involved in contradiction with each other.

3. The more consistently and radically the dogma of primitive savagery has been carried out, the more inevitably has it landed its advocates in the doctrine of primitive bestiality.

4. In their eagerness to destroy the possibility or credibility of primeval monotheism, these more consistent and radical theorists have inadvertently gone so far as to render a self-consistent evolutional biology or sociology impossible.

5. In consequence hereof the more clear-sighted of the representatives of Darwinism are just now deftly re-approaching the long-scouted historic conception—by representing the first men as superior to the modern savage in intellectual endowment, by calling their powers high, by considering their judgments of natural objects substantially correct, by admitting their knowledge of the true and normal form of the family, by conceding to them a truly human appreciation of ethical excellences and obligations, by allowing to them a capacity to conceive of an almighty Supreme Spirit, the Author and rightful Governor of the world, and by recognizing that nearly all religions present clear traces of corruption. So far as principles are concerned these representations surrender their whole case. With these data Adamic revelation becomes quite as possible, and quite as credible, as Abrahamic, or Mosaic, or Christian Revelation.

This unclad Adam of the garden was no more incapacitated for the knowledge of his Father than was that naked second Adam for whose advent Mary provided the swaddling clothes. If the former seems too undeveloped to be an organ of divine revelation, the latter, the highest of all these organs, the absolute Revelator, began quite as low. If nomad Arabs of to-day can see in storm and stars sublime manifestations of one almighty personal power, why could not the nomadic Abel as well? If the Gospel messenger of to-day can cause the rudest Fijian to know God and to experience a sense of divine for-

giveness and favor, why may not God's earliest preachers of righteousness have produced a like effect on sincere souls even before the discovery of the art of metal-working? Only let once the anthropological and sociological postulates demanded even by Herbert Spencer be granted, and the ancient historic conception of primitive monotheism becomes both possible and eminently reasonable. As an escape from the conflicting and mutually destructive theories of the evolutional school in its different departments, it presents, on merely speculative grounds, a positive attractiveness. Its full array of evidences, however, is simply co-extensive and identical with the evidences for the reality of Historic Revelation as a whole. Every thing which goes to show that God has intelligibly revealed himself to men at all, bears more or less directly upon the credibility of a revelation "in the beginning."

ART. III.—OUR PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

An Index to Periodical Literature. By WILLIAM FREDERICK POOLE, LL.D., with the assistance of WILLIAM I. FLETCHER. Royal 8vo. Third Edition. Boston: James R. Osgood & Co. 1882.

IN no department of our modern literature do we find a larger or more vigorous and healthy growth than in that of the periodical. To measure its full magnitude we must recognize the fundamental difference between the serial and the finished volume. In a work which reappears at regular intervals, whether it be by the day or the year, the purpose is all the same—to speak again, and still again, and to keep on speaking, with a view to the new demands that come with each oscillation of the pendulum. But with the formal book the purpose is very different. The writer proposes to begin, and continue, and have done with, his undertaking, and then let it go out on its mission to the world. He may improve his work and prepare new editions, but it always contains an element of finality as a store-house of his thoughts. The periodical is the mouth-piece of confession, party, class, and tendency. It takes note of the passing currents, and expects immediate results from its work. It is the lance which the knight proposes to use in rapid gallop, not the heavy arms which must stand him

in good stead for an all-day encounter. The accumulation of this periodical matter is simply immense. The beginning is to be found in martial and thoughtful Venice, where, in 1531, the first modern periodical appeared as "La Gazetta," a name taken from the little local coin, which was the price of the fugitive sheet. The idea spread rapidly into other European countries, and now, after the lapse of three centuries and a half, we have a world of periodical literature, whose influence in shaping and quickening thought is beyond all computation.

The undertaking of Dr. Poole contemplated the classification of only the firmer and broader serials, the magazine proper, and not at all the mere newspaper. The growth of his idea touches upon the romance. While a student in Harvard, in 1848, and handling the books of the university library in his spare hours, he prepared his "Index to Subjects treated in Reviews and other Periodicals," a good pamphlet of one hundred and fifty-four pages. It awakened a taste, but did far more in revealing a need. Later, in 1853, his thin *brochure* grew into the "Index to Periodical Literature," an octavo of over five hundred pages. The edition was limited, and was soon out of print. As early as 1864 the writer had no little difficulty in purchasing a copy, which he did, finally, when spending a day in the Boston Public Library, of the author himself, who was the librarian. For twenty years the book has been entirely out of the market. Now comes the new edition, the latest Index, an immense royal octavo of one thousand four hundred and sixty-eight pages, in attractive print and double columns. Its place in literature is, and must remain, alone. The infant has at last become a man. The Preface, which could with great propriety have been called the Introduction, recounts the story of the bibliographer's intense mania, of librarians in the Old and New World coming to his relief, and of his happy solution of the difficulties of his system of classification, and of the fulfillment of his dream in the present magnificent work. Every American may well congratulate himself upon the achievement. The periodical world is no longer a hopeless labyrinth, but an easy road in the broad noonday. One can easily find what has been written, in calm or passion, on any topic and in any magazine, by the mere turning of the leaves.

We can best measure the value of Dr. Poole's labors by taking a broad view of this field, which he has been the first to enter as both student and analyst. The rapid growth of the European periodical, from its humble origin beside a Venetian canal in the former half of the sixteenth century, to its present immense proportions, is a fair index of the activity of thought created by the Reformation. Our serial literature sprang into being simultaneously with Protestantism, the mother of both books and modern republics. Venice was at this very time in the throes of the religious revolution. The works of Luther and his coadjutors were not only circulated, but even printed, along the Grand Canal. Some little skill was needful to escape papal interdiction. For example, the "Loci Theologici" of Melanchthon—the Greek term into which he translated his name, after the usage of scholars, from his German name of Schwarzerd, or Black Earth—was translated into Italian, and published under the almost undistinguishable, but accurately Italianized, name of "I Principii della Theologia di Ippofilo de Terra Nigra." The war between the German Empire and Italy broke out in 1526, and in 1527 the imperial army sacked Rome itself, and for a long time occupied Naples.

With this army there was a large number of Protestants. They carried the reform south of the Alps, and the contagion spread into the Italian peoples.* We have positive proof that Melanchthon corresponded with the Venetian reformers in 1529, and that Modena was a Lutheran city.† In England we find the same singular coincidence between the beginning of periodical literature and the bitter conflict between Romanism and Protestantism. The fitting out of the Spanish Armada was regarded as an attack at once upon British liberty and the Protestant cause. At the very time when the Armada was tossing in the English Channel, in 1588, and the hopes of Rome were bright with the prospect of humiliated British reformers, the first periodical in the British islands saw the light. This was eighteen years after Pius V. excommunicated Elizabeth, one year after the execution of Mary Stuart, and just at the hour when papal anger was supreme at the firm

* Sarpi: Dans l'Italie même plusieurs personnes joûterent la nouvelle Réforme, Hist. du Concile de Trente, traduit par Caerager, vol. i, p. 85.

† Citta Lutherana. Quirini, in Præf. to Poli Epistt. Tom. iii, p. 84.

Protestantism of Elizabeth and her ministry. The first German periodical was issued in Nuremberg. There is a number of it in the British Museum. Its title is "Newe Zeitung aus Hispanien und Italien." It is in black letter, and bears date of 1534. The description of this rare treasure is thus furnished by the catalogue:

A gazette of excessive rarity, which appears to have been printed at Nuremberg. It contains the first news of the discovery of Peru, and has remained unknown to all the bibliographers we have been able to consult. In it is announced that the governor of Panumya, (Panama,) in the Indies, has written to his Majesty (the Emperor Charles V.) that a ship had arrived from Peru with a letter from the Regent, Francisco Piscario, (Pizarro,) stating that he had disembarked and seized the country; that, with two hundred Spaniards, infantry and cavalry, he had embarked; that he had arrived at the lands of a great lord named Cassiko, who had refused peace, and attacked him; that the Spaniards had been victorious, and had seized five thousand castillions, pieces of gold, and twenty thousand marks of silver; and that they had drawn two millions in gold from the said Cassiko.

This is by nine months the earliest document known authenticating the conquest of Peru. The next publication we have was also in German, and printed in Cologne, by J. Bureich, entitled "Certain tidings of what has taken place in the month of September last past of this current year, 1596, in Spain, Portugal, and France." In 1590 a semi-annual publication was commenced in Germany. The following is the title of one of the numbers: "A True Description of all principal and noteworthy Histories which have taken place in Upper and Lower Germany, also in France, Italy, England, Spain, Hungary, Croatia, Poland, Sweden, Transylvania, Wallachia, Moldavia, Turkey, etc., between the last past Frankfort Lent-Fair and the present Autumn Fair of this year, 1595, gathered and drawn up from day to day, partly from personal knowledge, partly from credible writings, by Jacobus Francus." The true name of the author was Conrad Lauterbach; he was born in Thuringia in 1534, and died in Frankfort in 1597.

The American periodical was born of the strife of the colonist with the rude forces of his new life and the ruder despotism of Whitehall. What had he to say, at his distance, from the happenings of the Old World? But it mattered little to him

what the Old World was doing and thinking. He had set up housekeeping for himself. The thought of independence really dawned on the colonial mind as early as the close of the seventeenth century. Our first American newspaper appeared in Boston in 1690. Its life was short, only one number appearing. It contained such an attack on the home government, on the ground of oppression, that the authorities cut its throat immediately, as "it came out contrary to law, and contained reflections of a very high nature." Only one copy of this remarkable production is supposed to be in existence. It is in the State Paper Office in London, and is a small sheet of four quarto pages, one of them being blank. On Monday, April 24, 1704, the "Boston News-Letter" appeared, on a half sheet of paper doubled into two leaves, having two columns on a page, and the entire paper one foot long and eight inches broad. Its imprint was, "Boston. Printed by B. Green, sold by Nicholas Boone at his shop near the Old Meeting House." From the opening address in it, it would be safe to infer that it was the property of John Campbell. It runs thus:

> This "News-Letter" is to be considered weekly, and all persons who have any houses, lands, tenements, farms, ships, vessels, goods, wares, or merchandises, etc., to be sold or let; or servants run away, [in Boston, mind,] or goods stole or lost, may have the same advertised at a reasonable rate, from twelve pence to five shillings, and not to exceed: who may agree with John Campbell, Postmaster of Boston. All persons in town or country may have said "News-Letter" every week, yearly, upon reasonable terms, agreeing with John Campbell, Postmaster, for the same.

We must suppose that Mr. Campbell was successful in his enterprise, for, after a while, we find him enlarging and improving his paper, and invoking the good public to lend their generous aid. In his second appeal he said:

> At the persuasion of several gentlemen, merchants and others, both in this and the neighboring provinces, who are sensible of the want of this public letter of intelligence for both foreign and domestic occurrences, the undertaker has once more attempted to promote the same, in hopes that all persons who love a public good will one way or other, will put to their helping hand to promote and support it, that the same may not only be carried on a fourth year, but also continued for the future. And all persons in town or country, who have a mind to encourage the same may

have the said letter of intelligence every week by the year upon reasonable terms, by agreeing with John Campbell, Postmaster of Boston.

But, lest that might not be enough, the publisher adds:

'Tis taken for granted that all such who had this letter of intelligence last year, and have not forbid the same, will be still willing to take it at the price which others give. If any are of a contrary mind let them signify it, and we shall forbear sending it to them. The undertaker has also been advised to carry on the occurrences where they were left off, and it is hoped that fourteen days will retrieve the same.

The "News-Letter" was a success, and only went down amid the convulsions of 1776. The journal that exerted the most marked influence during the Revolutionary War was the "Gazette," of Boston. It was established in April, 1755, and was the main organ of the patriots. It was published by Edes & Gill, and, at first, was issued in the form of a crown half sheet, in two pages folio; but about 1760 it was enlarged and printed on a demy sheet. Its office of publication became the habitual resort of the most distinguished political writers on the American side, among them James Otis, John Hancock, Joseph Warren, Thomas Cushing, Josiah Quincy, Jun., and the two Adamses, John and Samuel. This paper was a pest to the government. Every measure was examined and criticised in its columns by these able politicians with freedom and severity, and with a prodigious effect on the popular mind. It was in this journal that John Adams wrote, under the signature of "Novanglus," his celebrated series of papers in defense of the colonial cause, the first of which appeared in January, 1775. They were continued every week until April 19 of the same year, when the outbreak of hostilities at Lexington and Concord rendered further argument needless. Much as we must thank our grandsires for their restless swords, let us not forget that it was their pens that first drew their swords from the scabbard.

While patriotic impulses had much to do with the growth of American periodical literature, we must not forget that the theological and religious mind was active in the same direction. So far as we can determine, the great revival at the middle of the eighteenth century produced the first religious magazine published in this country. An odd hour in an obscure book-

stall brought into our possession a copy of a portion of this first American religious magazine, "The Christian History." It consists of weekly duodecimo numbers, of four leaves each, and bears the following title-page: "The Christian History, containing Accounts of the Revival and Propagation of Religion in Great Britain, America, etc., for the Year 1744. Boston, N. E. Printed by S. Kneeland and T. Green, for T. Prince, Jun., 1745."

This is the second and concluding volume. The first we have never been so fortunate as to see, except such extracts as are published in Gillies's "Historical Collections."* The serial closes with the following notice, which we introduce as a specimen of the business-like method with which even a religious publishing enterprise was conducted in those cruder days:

> Thus, according to the design of this paper, and from the best and most authentic materials we could obtain, we have given the reader a specimen of that wondrous work of God which has been in the midst of these years revived in many parts of Great Britain and America: and as the present paper concludes the year, and therewith the "Christian History," and there are some remarkable narratives yet unprinted, and others daily expected; it is proposed to publish them in entire pieces of about three sheets once a quarter, at twelve pence new tenor; and those who would encourage their publication are desired to send their names to Kneeland & Green, in Queen Street. The title-page and index to this volume will be speedily sent to the subscribers, when it is expected they will send in their dues.

After the declaration of peace the increase in American journalism was beyond all precedent. The freedom of the press having been guaranteed by the Constitution, newspapers multiplied, and continued to wield a supremacy over the public mind that has never yet decreased. Sometimes it is alarming; but, alarming or not, as the case may be, the fact is too well known to question for a moment. By the year 1810 the number of journals was 359, of which 27 were dailies, and the total annual issue was 22,321,000 copies. By 1850 the number of newspapers amounted to 2,800, with an annual circulation of 426,409,978 copies, or an average of nearly 22 copies to each person in our population, and of twelve journals to every 100,000 inhabitants. The number of daily newspapers, in

* Edited by H. Bonar, and published in Kelso, 1845.

1850, was 254, with an average circulation of 3,200 copies each. The number of newspapers and periodicals now published in the United States and Territories is as follows: dailies, 999; tri-weeklies, 49; semi-weeklies, 115; weeklies, 8,392; bi-weeklies, 46; semi-monthlies, 172; monthlies, 1,028; bi-monthlies, 12; quarterlies, 59—making a total of 10,872.*

We now come to the consideration of the utilization of our periodical literature for further literary purposes. For nothing good in literature ought to be considered a finality. Sometimes the magazine has been started somewhat flippantly, and you have not much respect for the editors, but the magazine itself may become a power. Take "Knight's Quarterly Magazine" as an illustration of the rollicking mood in which a periodical may be brought into life. A few young men, bright and sparkling Cantabs all of them—Praed, Macaulay, and Derwent and Henry Nelson Coleridge—resolved on starting a serial. They put out their proposition with that delicious bravery which marks the young man's trustfulness in the public before he gets to know it well:

> Some of us have no occupation.
> Some of us have no money.
> Some of us are desperately in love.
> Some of us are desperately in debt.
> Many of us are very clever, and wish to convince the public of the fact.
> Some of us have never written a line.
> Some of us have written a great many, and wish to write more.
> For all these reasons we intend to write a book.

The public had not much reason to expect mature matter after such a frank deliverance of motives, and yet, while this magazine has never figured extensively in the annals of periodical literature, no one can calculate the extent to which the editors and contributors gained that familiarity with the public, and with their own literary ability, which made them the writers into which they matured. Here lies one of the principal advantages of the periodical. The young aspirant for literary achievement has never attempted a book. It is too great a thought as yet. He is cramped, mayhap, for bread. At any rate, the burden of giving his inspirations to the public is full upon him. He is willing to do any thing by which to gain

* Rowell, "American Newspaper Directory," for 1883, p. 6.

the eye and ear of the million. So he writes an article for a magazine. He is admitted into the literary fraternity. Then come more confidence, more fresh thoughts, and finally the volume and volumes. We have just overhauled some numbers of the old short-lived "United States Literary Gazette," and there we find, away back in the twenties, some of our own Bryant's earliest and best poems, signed simply "B." Who can tell how much encouragement he derived from these first appearings of his poetic creations? The entire periodical was certainly worth all it cost, if for no other service than furnishing that one youth a stepping-stone to his now secure place in the pantheon of American minstrels. There is hardly any American poet, and many of the Victorian poets belong to the same category, who has not gained immensely from the advantages which were offered in the weekly and the monthly. It is not at all unlikely that most of the rare qualities which Macaulay developed as a historian found their germs in the care with which he found it necessary to prepare those fascinating articles in the "Edinburgh Review." Our own denominational literature abounds in illustrations of the same service. One has only to look into the back numbers of this Review to find abundant evidence of the single article as foreshadowing the later author of the formal volume.

The utility of the already existing treasures of periodical literature can be seen in the fact that many of the topics treated are of too special and minute a character to be cast into a volume. The whole magazine is replete with examples of this unique service to the general department of letters. As a specimen of the value of the one article which could never have been amplified into a volume, we may mention that choice bit of bibliographical information which Dr. M'Clintock furnished for this Review, in the year 1867, on the Abbé Migne's Roman Catholic Publishing House, a building occupying a good part of a block, under whose one roof the work of editing and printing the entire list of Greek and Latin Fathers is conducted. Poole's Index contains, on almost every page, monographs which, under any supposition, could not have seen the light had not the periodical been the vehicle for their presentation to the public. Where could we go for a satisfactory description of the Elgin Marbles, but to a single number of the "Quarterly Review;"

for an account of Sea Customs, but to "All the Year Round;" for a racy and full relation of the Scottish monks, but to a number each of the "North British" and the "Dublin;" for a thorough account of the Huguenots of Staten Island, by our genial friend, G. P. Disosway, but to the "Continental Monthly;" and for numerous descriptions of the early religious life along the Pacific coast, but to the now defunct "Overland Monthly"?

It may be urged that we find many of the more important magazine productions reproduced in volumes. True, but we must remember that the public of the periodical is different from that of the volume. Norman M'Leod wrote the most of his books in the monthly installments of "Good Words," of which he was creator and editor, and they afterward came out as bound volumes. Macaulay's Essays only solidified into a volume after appearing in the "Edinburgh," and even then under his protest. Trevelyan tells us that the author could never see why his Essays, and much less his Lays, should arrive at the dignity of a book. But there has been a different class of readers in each case. "Good Words" was sold at the news-stands, went every-where as a fugitive, stayed awhile on the parlor-table, and was finally thrown aside. But his "Old Lieutenant," "Parish Papers," "Highland Parish," "Character Sketches," "Starling," and "Eastward," as volumes, have gone into the home and the Sunday-school and the public library, and have gained a permanent place in the literature of all Anglic countries. Who that might want to read Macaulay's Essays would think now of depending on the "Edinburgh Review" for them? He found much to correct, and some harsh personalities to tone down, and finally came the Essays in the form of a volume. Only a small share, however, of even the best articles in periodicals are cast into the permanent form of a book. The most of them come before the public eye as monographs, and neither author or publisher thinks of later crystallization in a volume.

But the principal element of the utility of our periodical literature is to be found in the fact that, without it, we should be in the dark on many important departments of needful information. Suppose one is desirous of studying the aside-subject of the Plymouth Brethren. Where will he find his

sources? Marsden, in his "Dictionary of Christian Churches and Sects," does not dignify them with even a mention. There is, we think, no book (except M'Clintock & Strong's) which treats the subject even remotely. He is mainly dependent on the periodicals. By turning to Poole, he finds ten different magazine articles, from which he can derive data enough for a tolerably clear understanding of this diminutive, but still not to be despised, religious phenomenon. Who will direct to a single work that describes in full that rare and weird German, mystic, Jacob Boehme? Vaughan, in his "Hours with the Mystics," gives us some choice information. The few books of the man which were rudely translated into English were out of the London market a century ago. But there are four Review articles, and a most valuable one on Boehme's death-bed, which tell us what we wish to know. There is but one good work on Tractarianism, that by Mozley, yet no one can read it without being convinced of how much he does not know of this singular theological development of our century. But we find that the missing links are supplied by the Review articles, nearly fifty of which have appeared, and leave but little to be desired. Sir Thomas More figures as both humanist and reformer, but he is a strangely overlooked character. Merle d'Aubigné can give us eight volumes on Calvin, but only a few fragments on More, the friend of Erasmus. But our periodical literature furnishes twenty-eight articles on the man, in all departments of his activity. We have but one good life of Olympia Morata, by Bonnet, but the reviews give eight excellent articles on her character and her place in the age to which she belonged.

The service which the periodical has performed as a censor of literature has been incalculable. Authors can no more be trusted to conduct their enterprise without the benefit of the public judgment than any other class of public servants. The republic of letters has often lapsed into a despotism of scribblers. Unless there be a watchful master, the same thing may occur at any time. The political review, albeit it may call itself purely literary, has its partisan point to carry, and so all things must bend to it. The "Edinburgh," in the days of Jeffrey, would tolerate nothing but Whiggery. No wonder Carlyle hated it, and no wonder it hated Carlyle, though a

truce was now and then patched up, on the basis of only German criticism from his jagged pen. To our certain knowledge the editor of a British review wrote to one of its critics to prepare a review on a certain book. The book bore on the stand-point of the serial. The answer came back, in substance: "What kind of a review shall I write? Shall I praise or abuse?" He of the tripod promptly replied: "Abuse." In due time the abuse came out in stately form.

William Black, in his "Shandon Bells," throws a world of light on the inner machinery of the typical London editing of a periodical, and how things must be made to match. Whatever suffers, the stand-point, like Sidney Smith's equator, must be respected. Still, this is only an offset to the general utility of the magazine as a public censor. There is justice—an average justice—even in the editor's room. Between the Tory and the Whig review, there is to be found, after all, the golden mean. As to the criticism on books, there is no telling what would become of authorship were it not for the writer's eye on his masters, the editors. In every line he writes he knows that he must look out for the lash. Like a certain English author of whom we wot, he may leave London for the continent for six months, that he may not see a single savage critique on his latest work. But who can tell how much of a thinking he keeps up meanwhile, and how slily he prowls around the reading-desks of the circulating libraries when he gets back again, to catch some words that the world has been saying about him while he has been lounging under the lindens at Schwalbach, or looking out of his window in Chamouni? We have yet to hear of the most defiant author who was totally deaf to the scratch of the critic's pen. One has only to read Eckermann's "Conversations with Goethe" to see how this man of supreme equipoise kept informed upon, and was sensitive to, the very latest judgments of his critics. Who was more supercilious or intolerant than he when his impossible "Theory of Colors" was laughed at by the French scientists? Byron braved and defied his critics, and yet in the lines, and between them, of his "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers," one can easily see how deeply the "Edinburgh" lance has struck into the fiery spirit. One has only to read his life by Moore, and Jeaffreson's "Real Lord Byron," to see

how observant he was, even amid his unrestrained life at the Diodati villa, in Venice, and in Ravenna, of the writing and talking of the English critics concerning even his most proper cantos of "Childe Harold," not to mention his exceptionable poems. Did not his starting of the short lived "Liberal" have for its aim a self-defense? Who knows whither we should be hurled, with Shelley, Byron, Swinburne, and men of similar mettle to bear us, but for the timely bridles ready for use in the editorial offices? We cannot doubt that even Byron acknowledged and submitted to the restraints.

With all possible margin for injustice, we are compelled to hold that there is not a department of literature that has not been held in check by the sense of a prompt criticism. As to thoroughness of work, in going back to the first fountains, in all the fields of authorship involving dependence on facts, the knowledge of accountability to the critic has been a constant reminder of duty both to the public and one's self. Even in historical fiction the judgment of the critical periodical has been of prime value. There is good ground for believing that Walter Scott was impelled to minute fidelity to historic truth in his "Talisman," "Betrothed," "Count Robert of Paris," and other oriental treatments, as well as in his romances bearing on Scotch and English life, by an acute eye on the keen critics who were ready at any moment to find out a flaw in the wand of the Northern Wizard, and equally ready to tell the public of their discovery. George Eliot was as painstaking in studying the sources for her "Romola" as if she were writing a Gradgrind history of Savonarola, while her "Daniel Deronda" shows that her studies on Judaism, in Frankfort-on-the-Main and other continental centers, were as thorough as if her task were exact history. She had received a training as a book critic herself on the staff of the "Westminster," and knew that the company to which she had belonged would tolerate no careless stroke of the pen. She knew that the critics, like death, love a "shining mark." It is easy to say that she and Sir Walter, and all their guild, were a conscientious folk, and would have told the truth, critics or no critics. Still, with all the margin for conscience, we must yet hold that in every case the knowledge that there is such a thing as criticism, and that no author is safe after he has done slovenly work, or, Homer-

like, has "nodded," has been a constant motive to the faithful and full use of all possibly available material. The old charge that critics are failures in literature does not disturb our position in the least. We have not to do with what men have been, but with what they are. The existing critic of the new book holds an important office. He is to judge and reveal and help to place the book where it belongs. Like Sidney Smith, he may not have read his new book, but that is the author's fault. He should have written a book that the critic could not help reading.

A sense of sadness will come over one, in spite of himself, as he reflects on the large number of dead periodicals, whose graves are so frequent along the paths of literature. The many departed ones, whose names are known only to the curious, have each a story of adventure, enterprise, and final failure. The Index of Dr. Poole contains many names which we search in vain for among the living. We have also before us that curious directory to the American periodical cemetery prepared by Henry Stevens, of London. As it has never been on the market, having been only privately printed, we give the title entire: "American Books with Tails to 'Em. A Private Pocket List of the incomplete and unfinished American Periodicals, Transactions, Memoirs, Judicial Reports, Laws, Journals, Legislative Documents, and other continuations and works in progress supplied to the British Museum and other Libraries." We turn over these pages, every one of which abounds in dead periodicals, with new thoughts on the vanity of literature. Many a periodical has lived only a year. Some have weathered the storm three or four years, and then, like the Arab's tent, were to be found no more. The want of money, of party, of subscribers, and what not, has come in to stop the editing and the contributing and the printing. The poor incomplete thing has passed out of existence, and carried with it many bright hopes. Sometimes the death has been followed by a new galvanism, as in the case of the first "Putnam's Magazine," and this in turn has been followed by a selling-out, an absorption, or even death. One can find the parcels of these departed periodicals in the junkshops of the land, all the way from Ann Street, New York, to the dusty stalls of San Francisco. But the most have gone the way of all dead literature, into what

Macaulay used to call the "lining of the trunkmaker's boxes," or, still more, into the pulp that fills the papermaker's vats. We will not say, however, that even the departed periodical has been a total loss. Even the lost Pleiad was once a point of beauty. No one would be so rash as to suppose that "Salmagundi," although short-lived, was without its power in developing Irving and Halleck, and of still greater power in pointing out, to later publishers and editors, the quicksands that bring certain shipwreck. There is not a periodical now existing, in Europe or this country, that is not built up on the graves of the dead. Wisdom has come from experiment. This very Quarterly is not the product of the year that gave it apparent birth, or even of the "Methodist Magazine," that ran from 1818 to 1828. Its real origin must be found in that earlier "Methodist Magazine," published in Philadelphia by John Dickins, which died in 1798, after the issue of the second volume, and in that still earlier "Arminian Magazine," with Asbury and Coke as sponsors, which came to its death with the close of the second volume, in 1790. The popular magazines of our country, such as "Harper's Monthly," the "Century," and the "Atlantic Monthly," are the ripe fruit of failures. Publishers have learned wherein the failure of their predecessors lay, while editors have learned good lessons from the earlier occupants of editorial *sancta*. Hence we say, of the flourishing periodicals of to-day, that the living live on the no longer living.

Art. IV.—LETTERS AND MEMORIALS OF JANE WELSH CARLYLE.

Letters and Memorials of Jane Welsh Carlyle. Prepared for publication by Thomas Carlyle. Edited by James Anthony Froude. Two volumes. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883.

Of late years the press has teemed with anecdotes, personal reminiscences, and memorial sketches relative to the life and work of Thomas Carlyle. Yet, unique as is the character of this cynical Scotchman, grand as is his work, that as historian and prose-poet at once putting him in the foremost rank of English writers, it may fairly be questioned whether, in Froude's "Life of Carlyle," the most extensive as well as the most

authentic to be had, and to which, together with the "Reminiscences," we are to look for the history of Mrs. Carlyle's early life, Mr. Carlyle or his wife be the more interesting figure; for, as Lady William Russell put it: "Mr. Carlyle a great man! Yes; but Mrs. Carlyle, let me inform you, is no less great as a woman."

Mr. Froude was unsparingly censured for portraying the real Mr. Carlyle so admirably as he has done in his "History of the First Forty Years" of his life, a biography after Carlyle's own method, and as happily executed as if by the hand of that prince of biographers himself, the preacher of truth being unable to paint us a truer picture of himself. Now, again, the critics are lamenting Froude's obtuseness and indiscretion in giving us Mrs. Carlyle's letters just as annotated by her husband, confessedly a suitable person, recommending as a chivalrous deed the expunction of all passages relating to the petty details of home-life; maintaining, strange to say, that "unconscious autobiography, though interesting, is seldom fair and adequate." True, we were all startled by the novelty of the procedure, and somewhat shocked to find Carlyle so much of a bear, and his wife so menial a slave; for, had we known such to be the case, we should little have expected to find it chronicled here. It is equally probable that we might not have realized how completely Carlyle was wrapped up in what he conceived to be his mission, and how toilsome, so almost beyond expression, was the execution of it; how deep, pathetic a feeling he had for man and beast; nor have divined the exquisite delicacy and refinement of that *spirituelle* being that, for so many years, shed a halo of almost supernal brightness over his rocky pathway. And, to use the figure of the aforementioned critic, we are only too glad to believe that, had this ransacked house possessed the direst secrets to reveal, every door and shutter would have been flung wide open, "from kitchen to parlor." Had Mr. Froude acted on these suggestions of his censors, especially with regard to the latter book, the chief merit of his work would have been lost, and the letters, dull and insipid, like wine without sparkle or flavor; not the letters of a woman, least of all of this woman.

Woman, as Mrs. Carlyle well knew, has a knack for letter-writing, though it is not so certain that she understood the

philosophy of it. "'My dear,' said Geraldine, 'how is it that women who don't write books write always so much nicer letters than those who do?' I told her it was, I supposed, because they did not write in the valley of the shadow of their future biographer, but wrote what they had to say frankly and naturally." But authors are few, even among men, and it can hardly be claimed for the ladies that they are more frank and natural than men, or that there is such a vast difference, in this respect, between authoresses and their less fortunate sisters. The almost universal superiority of a woman's letter over that of a man is, I suspect, largely attributable to a difference in the cast of mind—the imaginative faculty predominating in woman as the reflective in man, a plan fruitful of so far-reaching and beneficent results as to be nothing less than providential, as has been capitally shown by Mr. Buckle. This gives woman a wonderful start over her prosy brother; for "the imagination is the strongest virtue to keep a book alive," and liveliness is what we look for in a letter.

The fact remains, anyhow; and Mrs. Carlyle seems to have had a clearer idea of the purpose of letter-writing and, certainly, a greater facility for realizing that ideal, than most women. "Decidedly I was meant to have been a subaltern of the daily press, not a 'penny-lady,' (almoner,) but a penny-a-liner; for it is not only a faculty with me, but a necessity of my nature, to make a great deal out of nothing." Or, if you please, what she surely meant, to invest every-day topics with such beauty and dignity as their frequent recurrence and a cultivated sensibility demand and justify. If this seem to you of small moment, only remember that, as Lowell says, "The true poet is he that detects the divine in the casual." So imbued was Mrs. Carlyle with this poetic sensibility that, with Wordsworth, she might well have sung:

> "To me the meanest flower that blows can give
> Thoughts that do often lie too deep for tears."

How true this is of Mrs. Carlyle one has but to read these letters to know. The record of the simplest occurrences, under her treatment, interests, nay, charms, us. Whether she be relating an adventure with a lost child, a visit to a decrepit old woman, or a scene with a servant; or humorously detailing her

exploits against dogs, cocks, etc., for a deliverance from all which disturbers of the peace she would insert a special prayer in the litany, the result is the same, a story as beautiful and engaging as any fairy tale, woven out of details seemingly the most prosaic.

Readers of the "First Forty Years" must remember Carlyle's thundering anathemas against the whole canine race. Mrs. Carlyle, it seems, had something of the same antipathy for the howl of a dog, acquired, no doubt, through association with her husband. A noisy cur had, as they thought, been silenced. But no. She writes Carlyle:

> The other night the candles were lit, and I had set myself with my feet on the fender to enjoy the happiness of being let alone, and to bid myself "consider." "Bow-wow-wow" roared the dog, "and dashed the cup of fame from my brow!" "Bow-wow-wow" again and again, till the whole universe seemed turned into one great dog-kennel! I hid my face in my hands and groaned inwardly, "O destiny accursed! what use of scrubbing? All this availeth me nothing, so long as the dog sitteth at the washerman's gate!" I could have burst into tears, but I did not! I ran for ink and paper, and wrote:
>
> "DEAR GAMBARDELLA: You once offered to shoot some cocks for me; that service I was enabled to dispense with: but now I accept your devotion. Come, if you value my sanity, and—" But he could not take aim without scaling the high wall, in doing which he would certainly be seized by the police; so I threw away that first sibylline leaf, and wrote another—to the washerman! Once more I offered him "any price for that horrible dog—to hang it," offered "to settle a yearly income on it if it would hold its accursed tongue." I implored, threatened, imprecated, and ended by proposing that, in case he could not come to an immediate final resolution, he should in the interim "make the dog dead drunk with a bottle of whisky, which I sent for the purpose!" Helen was sent off with the note and bottle of whisky; and I sat all concentrated, awaiting her return, as if the fate of nations had depended on my diplomacy; and so it did, to a certain extent! Would not the inspirations of the "first man in Europe" be modified, for the next six months at least, by the fact who should come off victorious—I or the dog! Ah, it is curious to think how the first men in Europe, and first women, too, are acted upon by the inferior animals!

We can best interest those with whom we can, in some sort, sympathize: Shakespeare is a general favorite because of his myriad mindedness: on his stage every class is represented,

from king to cobbler. Jane Welsh Carlyle is myriad souled, with enough intelligence to make it beautifully apparent on all occasions. An aristocrat herself, she takes no little pleasure in communing with plebeians; the best of scholars, she is at home in the company of the illiterate; a mover in the highest social circles, she counts it not a condescension to speak a word of cheer or do a deed of kindness to the lowest of her fallen brothers and sisters. From this universal love of others came the universal esteem in which she was held, the German servant declaring to Mrs. Carlyle that "a many, many peoples love you very dear." So bewitching was her influence over others, one would think she had recourse to a fairy's wand. From first sight one swore eternal friendship, and ever afterward rendered her unqualified adoration, the commons clamoring to become her servants, and countesses, kneeling beside the sofa, embracing her feet and kissing her hands to express their admiration. On one of her journeys Mrs. Carlyle inadvertently left her parasol in the coach, which misfortune she related to the landlady on entering the way-side inn. A gentleman present, a total stranger to Mrs. Carlyle, hearing this, bolted off, overtook the coach, and recovering the parasol, hastened back with it—all, he said, "for the pleasure of presenting it to Mrs. Carlyle."

As contrasted with Mr. Carlyle's writings how different the spirit. Every-where throughout Carlyle's works we meet with jeremiads on the ills of this "vile-spotted" world, he (in the "Correspondence of Carlyle and Emerson") more than once declaring that Emerson's is the only "human" voice that reaches his ear. Woe is the world! Numberless were the voices that reached Mrs. Carlyle, each articulating something human, too. Carlyle's attitude is that of a spoiled babe, who would rectify the world by chronic censoriousness; Mrs. Carlyle's, that of a true mother, who dares all and hopes all. The one is a pessimist, the other an optimist, as clearly set forth in the two following sonnets, the former by Carlyle, the latter by his wife:

CUI BONO?

What is Hope? a smiling rainbow
Children follow through the wet;
'Tis not here, still yonder, yonder!
Never urchin found it yet.

What is Life? a thawing ice-boat
On a sea with sunny shore.
Gay we sail—it melts beneath us!
We are sunk, and seen no more.

What is man? a foolish baby;
Vainly strives and fights and frets;
Demanding all—deserving nothing!
One small grave is what he gets.

One feels like answering Carlyle as Rae, "an industrious simpleton, nursing his baby on the street," did "a conceited, quizzing man," who accosted him: "Rae, I's wae for you." "Damn ye, be wae for yersel'!" But here is Mrs. Carlyle's

ANSWER.

Nay, this is hope: a gentle dove
That nestles in the gentle breast,
Bringing glad tidings from above
Of joys to come and heavenly rest.

And this is Life: ethereal fire
Striving aloft through smothering clay;
Mounting, flaming, higher, higher!
Till lost in immortality.

And man—O! hate not nor despise
The fairest, lordliest work of God!
Think not he made the good and wise
Only to sleep beneath the sod.

On the other hand, about the time Mr. Carlyle seemed so bewitched with the first Lady Ashburton, when, to use Mrs. Carlyle's own terse phraseology, "there was fine weather outside, but indoors blowing a devil of a gale," and she felt the need of stirring around to get the "green mold" that had been collecting on her brushed off by human contact, the notes did become plaintive, and, perhaps, never again assumed their wonted sprightliness; and, toward the close of life, Mrs. Carlyle wrote in a diary, which no one saw till after her death—for, let it be remembered, all her heart-failings were kept to herself: "I married for ambition. Mr. Carlyle has exceeded all my wildest hopes ever imagined of him, and—I am miserable." But to the most sanguine of us moments of despondency will come, and a momentary outburst no more characterizes one's feelings and thoughts than does the height of the waters at flood-tide determine the depth of a stream. Paradoxical as

it may seem, Mrs. Carlyle was at one and the same time the saddest and cheerfulest of creatures: within her own soul sad; to outsiders hopeful and cheering. She did not, like Carlyle, make up her theory of the world from her own experience. Hers was no depreciative view of life; though we fancy we see traces of Carlyle's teachings. They are traces merely: to her mind, man, if he but strove aright, was all-powerful and all-adorable; trials are necessarily incident to his progress, and hence should be cheerfully borne. Ease she did not have, either of body or of mind; but, as with Schiller, the fiery consciousness of her own activity stood her instead. Here is no *nirvana*, but rather a battle-ground, whereon, if we contend manfully, progress is inevitable and reward assured. Deep and abiding must have been the faith in human nature, the world's advancement, and in God's providence, of a being that saw no creature, however forlorn or besmirched and low-sunken, but that she extended a helping hand, whispering, "Up, brother, sister; you can, you must: for there is a higher place if you will only take it," so lifting them out of the mire and brightening their dark lives, that she seems an emanation of the divine Light.

We have noticed the different spirit that characterizes the productions of the two Carlyles. Between the styles there is hardly so marked a difference, or, perhaps, we should rather say that, while these are unlike, the resultant sensation on the reader is quite the same, that of rapturous delight. In Carlyle the imaginative faculty was developed to a greater extent than in most men: so vividly does he picture events that one feels that one loses nothing by not witnessing the spectacle, if one but read Carlyle's word-picture. This powerful effect Carlyle attains by a skillful marshaling of striking words in striking combinations. Mrs. Carlyle effects the same result by a hardly less clever ordering of ordinary words; so that, if she do not hold the mind with such intensity of interest as does Mr. Carlyle, she does not, on the other hand, awaken that puzzling, nay, almost repellent, feeling that, at first, seizes a reader of Carlyle. Notable as is the benign spirit every-where manifest, no less noteworthy is the simple, graceful, forcible directness of its diction, to which no little of the book's charm is due.

The womanly genius is stamped upon every sentence; every-

where there is exhibited a sprightliness and an audaciousness found alone in the speech of woman. In his "Among my Books," commenting upon Carlyle's style, Lowell says, "that the figures of some authors remind him of dolls stuffed with bran, but that Carlyle's, if punctured, yields blood; and, with equal propriety, this might be said of Mrs. Carlyle. Her characters seem embodiments of flesh and blood, they live and move, and we fancy ourselves moving with them—a thing more difficult in letter-writing, since they are presumed to especially interest those only to whom they may be addressed. The following displays the ingenuity and boldness of the woman no less than the vivacity of the writer. Mrs. Carlyle was having some repairs made on the house, in consideration of which the proprietor had promised "to indemnify them with the undisturbed possession of the house for five years!" In her account of the transaction to her husband, who always absented himself in times of renovation, Mrs. Carlyle wrote:

A piece of paper equivalent to a lease of the house for five years, "with the reciprocity all on one side," binding him and leaving us free. "Such a thing," old Sterling said, "as no woman but myself would have had the impudence to ask, nor any lawyer in his senses the folly to grant." This was one of those remarkable instances of fascination that I exercise over gentlemen of "a certain age;" before I had spoken six words to him it was plain to the meanest capacity that he had fallen over head and ears in love with me; and if he put off time in writing me the promise, it was plainly because he could not bear the idea of my going away again! No wonder: probably no such beatific vision as that of a real live woman, and a silk bonnet and a muslin gown, ever irradiated that dingy, dusty law-chamber of his, and sat there on a three-feet high stool, since he had had a pen behind his ear, and, certainly, never before had either man or woman, in that place, addressed him as a human being, not as a lawyer, or he would not have looked at me so struck dumb with admiration when I did so. For respectability's sake I said, in taking leave, "that my husband was out of town, or he would have come himself." "Better as it is," said the old gentleman; "do you think I would have written to your husband's dictation as I have done to yours?" Plainly he had lodged an angel unawares.

Intensely engaging throughout for its frankness, piquancy, bold originality, for the gleams of light shed upon two of the rarest characters in all history, "The Letters and Memorials" ranks high as a literary production, the letters being pronounced

by the "Boston Post," perhaps not injudiciously, "the finest of the nineteenth century." Beyond a doubt, it is a worthy companion of "The Correspondence of Carlyle and Emerson," and needs only to be read to win for itself a permanent place among the classics of English literature.

The life of the author is a romance. Of a worthy pair, themselves the descendants of John Knox and Sir William Wallace, in the little village of Haddington, Scotland, on July 4, 1801, was born Jane Baillie Welsh, a child from the very first endowed with an ambition that knew no bounds, an intellect whose quick and subtle apprehensions were the wonder of her companions as they were the delight of her parents and elderly acquaintances. "Mamma, O mamma, don't exposie me," once exclaimed three-year-old Jane, her mother having occasion to arrange some of her undergarments. Beautifully expressive, this, of a modesty and a precociousness quite foreign to the ordinary child. Yet Miss Welsh was no genius. Unusually endowed she doubtless was: of these endowments she made unusual use. Surely she is the offspring of that family of which it had been said that "there were in it many blackguards, but not one blockhead." At five the young student must begin Latin; but her parents are unwilling. Not to be outwitted, wary Jane, by some means, learns the first declension, and, under the cover, at night, is heard lisping, "*Penna*, a pen; *pennae*, of a pen," etc., and handsomely wins her point. This is no sudden outburst of a flickering flame, but rather the steady, ever-brightening light of an unquenchable fire. Dissatisfied with the few studies allotted the young miss of her period, Jane begged to be allowed to study like a boy. Her application was intense, Jane tying weights to her ankles to prevent oversleep, her rising hour being four! An early curiosity to know Latin led to the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of the classics. When, a few years after her first triumph, she is admonished that girls in Virgil do not play with dolls, it is determined that the doll's end shall comport with her mistress's dignity: the funeral pyre is built, the doll, with all her finery, laid thereon. For dolly Jane is spokesman; the last words of Dido the First (which Miss Welsh said she had as pat as A, B, C) are said, the torch is lighted, and Dido the Second ends her career, not without a few tears on

Jane's part. Miss Welsh seems to have imbibed much of the spirit of these authors: her every act was judged by the Roman standard, so that when, on her way to school, she is attacked by an old gobbler, she determines to stand her ground; for, she reasoned, Cæsar would have done so! Miss Welsh was then seven years old. "Thus," she said, "my inner world, at that time, was three fourths old Roman and one fourth old fairy."

Beautiful in person Miss Welsh must have been, judging from the following description by an intimate friend:

> As a girl she was extremely pretty, a graceful and beautifully formed figure, upright and supple, a delicate complexion of creamy white, with a pale rose-tint in the cheeks; lovely eyes, full of fire and softness, with great depths of meaning.

The girl of quick parts and tireless energy grew to the clear-sighted, keen-witted, scholarly young lady. Miss Welsh's insight was as penetrating as instantaneous; her wit, at times, scathing; in all the branches of the best schools, thorough; always she seemed

> "Bright as angel new-dropped from heaven."

So supremely fascinating a creature, that, as was said, no gentleman could be in her presence for five minutes without making her an offer of marriage. Although Miss Jewsbury has said that, "If flirting were a capital crime, Miss Welsh would have been in danger of hanging many times over," her conduct, all must admit, was unexceptionably high-toned. Edward Irving was her tutor while Miss Welsh was yet a girl. The zealous teacher paid his young charge a devotion that, as she herself afterward put it, was "passionately" returned. Meanwhile Irving went to a neighboring town and half formed a betrothal with a Miss Martin. Presently, finding that one lady has his hand and another his heart, Irving says as much to Miss Martin, and begs a release. But in Scotland constancy is a duty enforced in matters marital as well as in business affairs, and the Martins prefer holding him to his engagement. Irving hesitates, but is urged to keep faith by Miss Welsh, who, on learning of his entanglement, at once forbade him to address her on other than sisterly terms. Poor Irving, who had rendered his pupil great service by turning her mind from matters

exclusively literary to the Source of all light, loses his prize, reluctantly marries Miss Martin, returns to London, there to enter on his brilliant but tragic career. This was one of the sorest of Miss Welsh's many trials: the heart's choice had been sacrificed to another, and never did it forget the old or find a new.

The sad soul finds some relief in the pressure of life's duties. Miss Welsh was too brave to yield to this disappointment, too intent on future success to admit of any cessation of her unremitting toil. Into her elegant home was introduced a young man whose rugged exterior and ignorance of conventionalities hid not from her the genuine worth that lay beneath. The womanly intuition saw in this unprepossessing youth the future distinguished author, Thomas Carlyle, thenceforward the director of her studies. Irving having moved away, and being busily engaged in his religious work, Carlyle, in some sort, took his place. Books were interchanged, and criticisms of these, and, naturally enough, friendly notes. Like another teacher, then safely ensconced in his pupil's love, Carlyle professed a deeper attachment. At once he is admonished to discontinue the strain, for Miss Welsh then expected to marry Irving. But the friendly notes go on; in these and their author Miss Welsh took a keen interest. Next to Irving, Carlyle's best friend, Miss Welsh was the first to bestow appreciative notice on this odd character. Carlyle's manner, far from repelling, amused Miss Welsh—nay, drew her to him. A worshiper of intellect herself, we are not surprised that she was attracted by this phenomenal manifestation of it. Seemingly protected by the humbleness of her suitor's birth and position, our young lady was yet in danger of Cupid's dart. Her respect for Carlyle's great learning and sterling character grew to admiration; her admiration to love. A declaration of affectionate regard is mistaken by enraptured Carlyle for a promise of marriage. The mistake is quickly corrected. "My friend," wrote Miss Welsh, "I love you. I repeat it, though I find the expression a rash one. But were you my brother I would love you all the same. But your wife, never! Never, though you were as rich as Crœsus, as honored and renowned as you yet shall be." Knowing woman as he did, Carlyle heard not in this the everlasting nay. The heart's chords had been touched deeply, as a bequeathal, about this time, of all her property to Carlyle

sufficiently evidenced. Proudly conscious of the impression already made, even then too full of "desperate hope" to be cast down at the rejection of a proposal for whose acceptance he had no right to hope, he sought to quicken and intensify this impression. What a courtship! Carlyle again proposes: his blythe mistress now laughs, now mocks, now repents and becomes the most tractable of creatures. Irving had married, Carlyle had succeeded in his first literary ventures, Miss Welsh was longing for literary companionship; so extraordinary a fellow, thought she, must make rapid strides toward the goal of fame, on the attainment of which Miss Welsh promised to marry Carlyle. For, though he had published "Wilhelm Meister" and the "Life of Schiller," and his work had been approvingly noticed by Goethe himself, Carlyle was at this time almost penniless, with no regular profession, no social standing. Though craving neither fortune nor grandeur, Miss Welsh had, she said, certain wants that she was unwilling should be unmet, since the idea of a sacrifice should not enter into a voluntary union; also, she had a certain station in society, which she felt it a duty not to compromise. Mr. Carlyle, she knew, was capable of attaining both these *desiderata;* meantime she hoped to come to love him more; for, with characteristic frankness, she confessed a lack of that love which she deemed proper toward a husband. The scales seem partly to fall from Carlyle's eyes: not his circumstances alone, but himself also, need betterment. Disclaiming a willingness to bring her from affluence and respectability to his poverty and obscurity, professing to find in her companionship his greatest stay and comfort, he proposes for them "to go forth their several ways." Miss Welsh's answer goes a long way toward explaining the character of the womanhood, the quality of her love: "How could I part from the *only* living soul that understands me? I would marry you to-morrow, rather; our parting would need to be brought about by death or some dispensation of Providence. Were you to will it, to part would no longer be bitter; the bitterness would be in thinking you unworthy." But, verily, we cannot see that she does get her own consent. Carlyle's character she revered, his wisdom she well-nigh adored; if not up to her ideal, confessedly she liked him above all others—always excepting him in whom she seemed to find a

second self, Edward Irving. She seems to get the assent of the head, not the consent of the heart, though one could never have discovered this from her conduct then or afterward. The marriage is determined upon. Carlyle has a dozen different propositions, as ludicrous as they are disregardful of his wife's comfort. Suddenly awaking to the fact, as he thought, that literature is the wine of life, the book-worm would become a farmer! One laughs outright. But the end is not yet: Miss Welsh has a bleak place, Craigenputtock, to work which, it strikes Carlyle, is better than renting, and of this desire he informed Miss Welsh. "I tell you it will not do," wrote she. "You must play Cincinnatus elsewhere. For my part, I could not live there a month with an angel!" 'Tis well we cannot peer into the future: she did live there six wearisome years with an angelic being, albeit one of the fallen! Now 'tis an Edinburgh cottage, where the great man can slam the door in the face of intruding visitors. Now 'tis at Scotsbrig, under his father's roof, already crowded, though of this Carlyle seems unaware. Although he had just asked her to share the rude hospitality of his own home, where surely her inconvenience would have been no less than his needless irritation in the home of her mother, Carlyle discourteously answers in the negative a proposal that they live with Miss Welsh's mother in Edinburgh, where finally the two settled alone.

Beautiful was Miss Welsh's behavior under these provoking circumstances. She writes Carlyle thus:

> This time twelvemonth nothing would content you but to live in the country, and, though a country life never before attracted my desires, it nevertheless became my choice the moment it seemed to be yours. In truth I discovered a hundred beauties and properties that hitherto had escaped my notice, and it came at last to this, that every imagination of the thought of my heart was love in a cottage continually. *Eh bien!* and what then? A change comes over the spirit of your dream. While the birds are yet humming, the roses blooming, and the small birds rejoicing, and every thing is in summer glory about our ideal cottage, I am called to live, *in prospectu*, in the smoke and bustle and icy coldness of Edinburgh. Now this I call a trial of patience and obedience. And, say, could I have complied more readily had I been your wedded wife ten times over? Without once looking behind, without even bidding adieu to my flowers, I took my way out of our paradise to raise another in the howling wilderness. A very miracle of love.

Each, uneasy, facetiously tries to stay the other. "I am resolved in spirit," wrote Miss Welsh, "and joyful—joyful in the face of the dreaded ceremony, of starvation, and of every other horrid fate. O, my dearest friend, be always so good to me, and I shall make the best and happiest wife. When I read in your looks and words that you love me, then I care not one straw for the universe besides. But when you speak of me as a circumstance of your lot, fly from me to smoke tobacco, then, indeed, is my heart troubled about many things." Ominous words these—we had almost said prophetic. Mrs. Carlyle is said to have had some temper herself. She continues:

I am going really to be a very meek-tempered wife. Indeed, I am begun to be meek-tempered already. My aunt says she could live with me forever without quarreling, so reasonable and equable am I in my humor. Do you perceive, my good sir, the fault will be entirely your own if we do not get on most harmoniously together?

After drawing stay from all the philosophers, German and English, Carlyle adds:

You are very kind to impute my ill-natured speeches (for which heaven forgive me) to their true cause, a disordered nervous system. Believe me, Jane, it is not I, but the devil speaking out of me, that could utter one harsh word to a heart that so little deserves it. O! I were blind and wretched if I could make thee unhappy. But it will not and shall not be; for I am not naturally a villain, and at bottom I do love you well.

Several times, in his annotations of his dead wife's letters, Mr. Carlyle exclaims, "O, sinner that I was!" with how much propriety will be seen as we proceed.

"The last speech and marrying words of that unfortunate young lady, Jane Baillie Welsh," as our heroine playfully put it, wherein she instructs Carlyle as to gloves, ceremony, etc., promising him that he may smoke two cigars on their homeward journey, is forwarded to her spouse, the dreaded ceremony over with, October 17, 1826. On the evening of the same day they reach Comley Bank, Edinburgh, for a year or two their home.

Various references have been made to Mrs. Carlyle's unhappiness, which was intense beyond expression. Only an angel could have been happy; and even an angel could not have

striven more zealously to make others so, or more delicately have hidden the heart's own bitter disappointment. The tender hot-house plant withers when treated as the hardy shrub of the field. She that had hitherto had nothing to do except to cultivate the mind, found herself too busy with domestic duties to engage in any intellectual work, even had he, of whom it had been said that "a glacier on a mountain would have been as human a companionship," wished her fellowship. As to what we call love, by which most men and women lay great store, of this Mr. Carlyle seemed incapable—really this was too insignificant for the philosophic mind. Do these statements seem wild? Take a peep at their second home, Craigenputtock, the weirdest of places, sixteen miles from town, in the midst of a peat bog, no visitor putting in for months at a time, one's ears being regaled, meanwhile, by the nibbling of sheep a quarter of a mile off, easily heard, so ghost-like was its silence. Here, where, as Mrs. Carlyle informs us, her two immediate predecessors went mad and the third took to drink, she was the veriest slave. Cook, milk, scour, all of these by turns; not infrequent turns either, it being difficult to obtain an efficient servant, the Carlyles never having one from poverty. This had not been so galling had Mr. Carlyle manifested any appreciation of his wife's efforts to please him. But no: Mr. Carlyle was too much engrossed in his own work, rambling among the clouds, to notice her who, without the compensation even of a grateful word or an approving smile, not to speak of a helping hand, from her master, was uncomplainingly slaving it beside him, Mrs. Carlyle seeing her husband but a few moments a day, these glimpses being stolen, she tells us, while her lord was shaving! Now do we appreciate the following, written in a diary never seen by any one save herself: "To a swallow building under our eaves," dated the "Desert:"

> Thou hast past fair places in thy flight,
> A world lay all beneath thee where to light.
> And strange thy taste.
> Of all the varied scenes that met thine eye—
> Of all the spots for building 'neath the sky—
> To choose this waste.

Nor was this loneliness one of place only, or of this place. In London, their home for the latter and greater part of life,

when Carlyle had become famous and had leisure enough to take a vacation of a month or two's duration every summer, to make repeated visits of a day or two's length to Lady Ashburton's, while his wife was suffering untold agonies of body and mind, Mrs. Carlyle saw her husband half an hour a day! Mrs. Carlyle thought, and very reasonably too, that she that had laid down name, wealth, rank, and had worn out herself in trying to shield her husband from vexation and to forward his interests—in a word, she that had given him her life—merited at least a few moments of his time and consideration. This discontent, aggravated by the supercilious treatment received at the hands of her with whom Carlyle seemed so fascinated, she made known to her husband. Without reference to Carlyle's relations to Lady Ashburton, this seems to me human nature, and I cannot ask of Mrs. Carlyle what is possible only to angels.

Yet things moved on as smoothly as if their life were one long-drawn-out honeymoon. To those who saw it, Mrs. Carlyle's home seemed a paradise, this, too, whether in London or the "Devil's Den" of Craigenputtock—equally in the years when their living was scant as when, in after times, their income was comfortably sufficient. This scrupulous housewifery was attained not without a few adventures and much toil on Mrs. Carlyle's part. She was somewhat startled by the grossness of her ignorance concerning household matters.

> Being an only child, and brought up to great prospects, I was sublimely ignorant of every branch of useful knowledge, though a capital Latin scholar and very fair mathematician! It behooved me, in these astonishing circumstances, to learn to sew! Husbands, I was shocked to find, wore their stockings into holes, and *I* was expected to look to all that; also, it behooved me to learn to cook.

At first the delicate organism shrank from the uncongenial tasks. Pathetic is the account of her first attempt at bread-making, in which she relates that, having sat up till three o'clock in the morning over a loaf of bread, a sense of forlornness and degradation stole over her. Suddenly she bethinks herself of Benvenuto Cellini's sitting up all night, watching his Perseus in the fire.

> After all, in the sight of the higher powers, what is the mighty difference between a loaf of bread and a statue of Perseus, so that

each be the thing one's hand has found to do? The man's determined will, his energy, his patience, were the really admirable things of which his statue of Perseus was the mere chance expression. If he had been a woman living at Craigenputtock, with a dyspeptic husband, sixteen miles from a baker, and he a bad one, these same qualities would have come out more fitly in a loaf of bread.

Heroic woman! that could follow out this principle, as difficult of application as simple of comprehension and Christ-like in influence, so eloquently stated by Mr. Carlyle: "Man! symbol of eternity imprisoned into time! it is not thy works, which are all mortal, infinitely little, and the greatest no greater than the least, but only the spirit thou workest in, which can have worth or continuance."

"Crown me with all the laurels that ever decorated man's brow: were it other than the bitterest of mockeries if she that had struggled with me were not there to share them?" wrote he that, for three years, could not find time to go out and buy his poor invalid wife a brougham! Yet, as far as his actions fell short of his professions, Mr. Carlyle was "not naturally a villain, and at bottom loved his wife real well"—so far as he knew how. There are circumstances that extenuate, none that excuse, Carlyle's boorish treatment of his wife. Gifted with a vivid imagination and, at the same time, afflicted with dyspepsia, Carlyle saw only the evil side of things, and that through magnifying glasses. This fact, no doubt, accounts for his acerbity. But we cannot but think of Schiller, to say nothing of Mrs. Carlyle, who, though harassed quite as much as Mr. Carlyle, not, it may be, by his "diabolical apparatus," was the calmest of men. Again, at Carlyle's home, his mother and sisters did most of the housework, and he, unmindful of their different bringing up, unwisely expected of his wife what he had seen done by his mother. The fact is, that of the two theories of womanhood—the poetic and the materialistic—the one championing refinement to the sacrifice of usefulness, the other, utility to the sacrifice of beauty and culture, finding in woman a child-bearer and domestic, Carlyle adopted the latter—a theory held in common with not a few of his contemporaries. Naturally enough, Carlyle did not encourage his wife to enter the field of literature, her place being, as he thought, in the cook-room or at the broom-handle; not, indeed, for lack of

talent or capacity, but as better comporting with woman's sphere. Alike by instinct and by breeding, Carlyle was unfitted to rightly determine woman's province or appreciate her nature, least of all his woman's.

But what sublime indifference to his wife's sufferings, what ingratitude for her laborious services! But Mr. Carlyle did have a heart, and it beat lovingly toward his mother and her family, no more filial or fraternal conduct than his being on record. Leigh Hunt, a frequent visitor and an intimate friend of his, thus warmly testifies to Mr. Carlyle's humanity:

> I believe that what Mr. Carlyle loves better than his fault-finding, with all its eloquence, is the sight of any human face that looks suffering and loving and sincere; and I believe, further, that if the fellow-creature were suffering only, and neither loving nor sincere, but had come to a pass of agony in this life which put him at the mercy of some good man for some last help and consolation toward his grave, even at the risk of loss to repute, and a sure amount of pain and vexation, that man, if the groan reached him in its forlornness, would be Thomas Carlyle.

Actions do speak louder than words. Carlyle was deeply imbued with the idea that he had a mission to right this disjointed world by instructing its poor fools, and, swallowed up as he was in his mission, he was lost to humanity; and we can but smile at the egotism of this typical one of the Britons, "not a bull of them all but believes he can bear Europa on his back," and wonder at the short-sightedness of a man that saw so much wrong in the universe, but nothing in his own ill-managed kingdom, the home.

Humdrum as was Mrs. Carlyle's way of living, she managed to extract therefrom many pleasures, not the least of which (the highest, resulting from a consciousness of duty performed, has already been noticed) was to have her friends call. The depth and the universality of their love has been incidentally shown. No visitor, however transient his stay, went off without being impressed with Mrs. Carlyle. She was the entertainer; and many amusing stories does she tell of her receptions: how, for instance, the Jeffreys once visiting them very unexpectedly at Craigenputtock, and the larder being rather empty, she sprang upon a horse, rode sixteen miles to town, made her purchases, hurried back home, and, having gotten dinner with her own hands, presided at the table as gracefully

as ever did a queen. She does not seem to have especially liked us Americans; in fact, none save Emerson, of whose visit to Craigenputtock she said that it was the only one made for such a purpose since the time of Noah's ark. While living at Chelsea, Mrs. Carlyle, on returning home from visiting one evening, was told by the servant that some one was awaiting Mr. Carlyle in the library. She writes:

> On proceeding thither, a tall, lean, red-herring-looking man arose from Carlyle's desk, at which he was writing, and, running his eyes over me, from head to foot, said, "O, you are Mrs. Carlyle, are you?" An inclination of the head, intended to be hauteur itself, was all the answer he got. "Do you keep your health pretty well, Mrs. Carlyle?" said the wretch, nothing daunted, that being always your regular Yankee's second word.

Then, pouring upon her a broadside of impertinent questions, receiving in return churlish answers, "that spattered off the rhinoceros hide of him as if they had been sugar-plums," and being informed that Mr. Carlyle might not return for some time, he leaves his note and departs; whereupon Mrs. Carlyle soliloquizes: "If Mr. Carlyle's increasing reputation bore no other fruits than congratulatory Yankees and the like I should vote for its proceeding to diminish with all possible dispatch." Mr. Carlyle was not very accessible, Mrs. Carlyle telling us of his turning off two of his boon companions of early life, when she came to the rescue and saved him from doing what he would afterward have regretted. The following, occurring in a letter to her husband, shows in what awe Mr. Carlyle was held by people generally:

> "There is just one thing," said Madame —— de —— to Rev. John Barlow, "I wish you to do for me—to take me to see Mr. Carlyle." "Tell me to ask the Archbishop of Canterbury to dance a polka with you," said Barlow, aghast, "and I would dare it, though I have not the honor of his acquaintance; but take any body to Mr. Carlyle, impossible!"

Though she has left us but few memorials of her literary talent, Mrs. Carlyle was truly a woman of intellect, and, pre-eminent as was her character by reason of its many rare virtues, the intellectual is scarcely second to the moral endowment. A hard student she always was, even during the Craigenputtock *régime* finding time to read "Don Quixote" and other classics

in the original. At thirteen she wrote a drama said to have been of more than usual merit, though committed to the flames soon after its production. After the busier period of life had passed Mrs. Carlyle began a novel, which, owing to a complete failure of health, she was unable to finish. "None of the writing women," thought Charles Dickens, a contemporary of George Eliot, "come near to her at all." Carlyle, while he would not admit her to literary partnership, never failed to avail himself of her criticisms, which were acute and far-reaching, as we may judge from her prophetic foreshadowing of Carlyle's talent. In his own inimitable way Carlyle estimated his wife's literary ability: "Not all the Sands and Eliots and babbling coterie of celebrated scribbling women that ever strutted over the world in my time could, it seems to me, if boiled down and distilled to essence, make one such woman." The "Letters and Memorials," itself of the highest literary merit, has yet its chief value as a token of what might have been accomplished. Certainly Mrs. Carlyle accomplished much under most adverse circumstances; and it is not improbable that, under more favorable conditions, "like the eagle renewing her mighty youth and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full midday beam, she would have purged and unscaled her long-abused sight at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance."

When we come to speak of character, we, as Merivale in writing of Cæsar, exclaim, (we hope with better reason,) "One can but be silent in the presence of the perfect." Energetic when energy and forethought were at discount, patient amid unparalleled vexations, serene and trustful by the side of a joyless Jeremiah and doubting Thomas; withal so intelligent, so forgetful of self, so thoughtful of others, with Mr. Carlyle we may well ask, "Did ever one come more direct from the empyrean?"

ART. V.—THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE DISCIPLINE.

THE proper administration of the Discipline is a matter of grave importance to the welfare of the Methodist Episcopal Church. As yet, it has not received the attention which its importance demands. There is, perhaps, no part of our ecclesiastical machinery so little understood, and so inefficiently worked, as the part which relates to the administration of the discipline. Not that the machinery itself is greatly defective. It is not. No other ecclesiastical body has a better. The fault is not in our judicial system, but in its administration. It is this that is frequently inefficient and open to criticism; and that, too, when it is possible for it to be most efficient in its workings and trustworthy in its results.

We are suffering both from laxness of administration and from clumsiness in its attempt. The difficulty attending and the labor involved in the investigation of alleged crimes charged against offenders are so great, that the administrator sometimes shrinks from them, and evades the unpleasant task, if possible. The result is, offenders remain in the Church, elements of weakness to it, and stumbling-blocks in the way of its progress. Or, if it is attempted, the methods of investigation are frequently such that they fail to elicit the truth. The consequence is, the guilty escape, or, perhaps, what is rarer, the innocent suffer. Because of this, ecclesiastical courts are looked upon with suspicion, and the trials conducted in them assumed to be inefficient in their methods, and unreliable in their findings—a result greatly to be deplored.

We lack uniformity of administration, also. One pastor or presiding elder tries to enforce the discipline and preserve the purity of the Church; another evades or ignores it. Different localities and different administrators have different modes of administration. With some, it is lax; with others, what is called liberal; with still others, critical and exact. All these—the laxness, the clumsiness, and the lack of uniformity—are hinderances in the way of the true work of the Church. Any Church that does not keep itself pure, that does not sho wintelligence and wisdom in the administration of its laws, and that does not have power enough, as a system, to impress

uniformity in its administration, cannot long command the respect, secure the confidence, or exert much influence for good over mankind. The avenues through which the Church reaches and controls men are the avenues of its wisdom, efficiency, and purity; and if the world does not see in it these elements—if it does not possess them, it has lost its influence for good and its power over men.

To call attention to these evils, and the possibility of remedying them, and at the same time stimulate the Church to effort in that direction, is the object of this paper. In it I propose to discuss the whole question of administration, under the five following general divisions of the subject:

I. To call attention to the principles of authority underlying the government of the Church, by and through which it is possessed of power to exclude unworthy persons from its body.

II. To show the limits and kind of jurisdiction which the Methodist Episcopal Church gives to its administrators, and the several duties it imposes upon them.

III. To define the qualifications and the spirit which should characterize the true administrator, in conducting all investigations coming under his jurisdiction.

IV. To define the manner in which a Church court should be conducted, and to discuss the application of the principles and rules of evidence prevailing in civil courts to ecclesiastical courts.

V. To show that our ecclesiastical courts may become the most reliable of all courts, the surest in eliciting truth and rendering verdicts which will command the approval of honorable and thinking men.

In accordance with this plan I proceed,

I To call attention to the principles of authority underlying the government of the Church, by and through which it is possessed of power to exclude unworthy persons from its body.

The authority which the Church has over the individuals composing it, rests upon the broadest possible foundations, both of reason and the will of God. They are the same as those upon which the state rests, and are twofold in their origin and character. One of the greatest philosophers and jurists of

modern times has said, concerning the principles underlying civil government: "One thing is always essential to civil societies: that each member of a society should relinquish in favor of the social body a portion of his rights, and there should be a power capable of governing all individuals, of giving them laws, and of coercing those who refuse to obey." Aristotle, long centuries ago, said, "A truly human life is in society; individuals are only accidental parts of the social whole." * Hence, the individual being less than society—on the principle that a single part is less than the sum of all the parts—if he infringes against the rules which govern the whole, and which are ordained for its interests, society must deal with the offender. Therefore, he says, "The moral mean in social life is between doing wrong and suffering wrong, which is justice." All governments are founded upon these principles; all states stand on these foundations. They are simple, but they are universal, and no social body can exist without them. The Church, on its human side, is a civil society, a state, and, as such, it must have government and administration. If it is to command the respect of mankind, and conserve the ends for which it exists, it must be possessed of these powers. Viewing the Church from this stand-point, another high authority has said of it: "The quality of the true visible Church is purity, and a union under no other than moral motives. The relation of its members to each other rests upon the principles of freedom. The Church is, therefore, a free state, neither a hierarchy nor democracy." †

This definition of the Church is almost an exact definition of ecclesiastical Methodism. "Such a society is none other than a company of men having the form and seeking the power of godliness." They are "banded together" for this purpose. It is a voluntary union for moral ends—a free state. This implies government, discipline, laws, and their execution. Being a voluntary and free state, existing for the purposes named, it cannot "coerce" in the sense of inflicting physical penalty, but it can by inflicting moral penalty. It can compel compliance with its laws or exclusion from its body, and the privileges belonging to that body, for the attainment and

* Wolff, "Law of Nations."

† Kant, "Religion within the Bounds of Pure Reason."

preservation of the ends for which it exists, namely, its "essential quality," *purity*.

But there is another and a higher class of principles than those already named underlying the government of the Church. These are principles of divine character and authority. The Church is more than a free state existing for moral ends; it is *God's visible kingdom among men*. It has an authority, therefore, higher than that given it by the individuals who voluntarily enter into it and compose its body. God is its king and lawgiver. His authority is supreme; and he to whom he delegates it, possesses it—holds it by supreme right, arising out of divine enactment. That God has committed authority to the Church to govern, cannot be denied; and this authority, though exercised by the Church, is *God's authority*. Whether we consider this right to govern as lodged in the whole body of Christians, and delegated by them to those whom they set apart to rule—as we most steadfastly believe, and as Methodism teaches—or as committed to the few, and transmitted from them by the "laying on of hands" to others, in either case the authority is in the Church, and is God's authority.

The Holy Scriptures teach us that the state has this element of divine authority lodged in it. The thirteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans fully establishes this fact. Such declarations and exhortations as the following are unequivocal and explicit upon this point: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. ... For he [the civil ruler] is *the minister of God* to thee for good . . . he beareth not the sword in vain: *for he is the minister of God*, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing."

If this be the relation of the civil government and the civil ruler to the divine government and the divine Ruler, how much more the Church, which is God's kingdom among men, uncircumscribed by political boundary, by nationality, race, or age! A kingdom, as described by the prophet Daniel (set up)

to be "an everlasting kingdom," one which is to break in pieces and subdue all others, and fill the whole world, making the civil powers but limited fragments of its own power, which, while separated from them, yet permeates and controls them. The most important of all institutions, the most universal and perpetual—the "New Jerusalem descending from God out of heaven," into which the glory of the nations is to be gathered, and into which kings are to bring their treasures —the power that is to subdue the world, overcome evil, develop holy character, train souls for heaven, and into which nothing shall enter "that *defileth*," and which is finally to be presented to God "a glorious Church without spot or wrinkle," *must* be under the dominion of a divine government, and *have lodged* in it an authority more than human, even the authority of God.

The Holy Scriptures nowhere formally state and define this authority in so many words, but they do most explicitly recognize and speak of it. St. Paul, in his first letter to Timothy, third chapter, speaking of the qualifications of a bishop, says, he must be "one who ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how can he take care of [rule] the Church of God?" Again, in the fifth chapter, he says, "Let the elders that *rule well* be counted worthy of double honor." "Against an elder receive not an accusation but before two or three witnesses." "Them that sin, *rebuke* before all, that others may fear." "Lay hands suddenly upon no man, neither be *partaker of other men's sins*." "I charge thee before God, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things, without preferring one above another, doing nothing by partiality." All this teaches us that *elders ruled;* that Timothy, as an ἐπισκοπος, by virtue of his office, if not his order, had still *higher authority* than they, and the apostle, by virtue of his apostleship, still *higher authority* than Timothy; and that this authority extended to the *arrest, arraignment, trial,* and *expulsion* from the Church of unworthy members and ministers. We are taught thereby that the early Church was under government, God having made them who were in authority "overseers to feed the flock," and not only to feed them, but to *arraign, discipline,* and *expel* the unworthy by a

divine authority committed to them, and for the proper exercise of which they were not only responsible to the Church, but to God himself.

In the First Epistle to the Corinthians, fifth and sixth chapters, there is given a case in point. There was one, it seems, allowed to remain in the Church who was known to be guilty of gross immorality. The apostle severely rebukes the Church therefor, and says: "But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; *with such a one no not to eat.* For what have I to do to judge them also that are without? do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. *Therefore put away from among yourselves that wicked person.*" And then, as if anticipating an objection to this action upon the ground of a lack of competent authority in the Church to exclude, he says: "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life."

In the Gospel by St. Matthew, eighteenth chapter, our Saviour, in a most marked and positive manner, recognizes and speaks of this authority as follows: "Moreover if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church: *but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a* HEATHEN MAN AND A PUBLICAN."

Nothing can be stronger than this. The absolute and utter separation and exclusion from all the religious privileges of the Jewish Church of a heathen, or publican, was most thorough and complete. And such is to be the attitude and action of the Church toward the persistent and defiant offender. The verse following the quotation already given asserts, in the strongest manner, the authority of the Church, and, while no Protestant will claim it as teaching what the Roman Church claims, yet it does imply that excommunication from the

Church is a fearful thing—a penalty which to the incorrigible must appear like the foreshadowings of that darkness which will accompany the wrath of the judgment thunders. "Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

The Church, then, is still, as of old, a Theocracy. The Lord Jesus Christ is its head and ruler, the word of God its law. Its authority to administer discipline is by divine enactment. Those into whose hands this authority is committed must exercise it according to the direction of the Supreme Head of the Church, and the laws he has given. They have no choice; they must be faithful to their trust, or stand guilty before their Judge. The Methodist Episcopal Church, as a part of the body of Christ, recognizes these principles, and assumes the authority they imply. It says of its fundamental rules and requirements: "These are the General Rules of our societies; all of which we are taught of God to observe, even in his written word, which is the only rule, and the sufficient rule, both of our faith and practice. And all these we know his Spirit writes on truly awakened hearts. If there be any among us who observes them not, who habitually breaks any of them, let it be known unto them who watch over that soul as they who must give an account. We will admonish him of the error of his ways. We will bear with him for a season. But if then he repent not, *he hath no more place among us.* We have delivered our own souls."

Having called attention to these great basal principles and sources of authority in the Church, we are led naturally to ask, What provisions has the Methodist Episcopal Church made for the exercise of this authority? This leads to my second general division of the subject:

II. To show the limits and kind of jurisdiction which the Methodist Episcopal Church gives to its administrators, and the several duties which it imposes upon them.

The Methodist Episcopal Church indicates quite clearly the manner in which discipline shall be administered, and designates the persons it selects and authorizes to perform its functions in this respect, defining and limiting their several duties; and it recognizes this authority as existing in the

whole body of the Church, and not exclusively in its ministers or officers, except as delegated to them from the Church as a whole.

Part third of our Book of Discipline, chapters first, second, and third, containing paragraphs from 200 to 253, inclusive, covers the whole ground of administration. Space will not admit of extended quotations. Any one so desiring can sift the matter in detail by reading these chapters and paragraphs.

The Methodist Episcopal Church has, for laymen and bishops, *two* well-defined courts, and *one* not well-defined, making three in all. The two well-defined are courts of *trial* and courts of *appeal.* The third and *ill-defined* court is that provision which is made in our Book of Discipline whereby (1) A preacher in charge, when differing in judgment from a majority of a committee, may refer a case to a Quarterly Conference, which may order a new trial, (¶ 235.) (2)Where the president of an Annual Conference may correct *errors of law* made by a Presiding Elder in an appeal case before a Quarterly Conference, and an Annual Conference itself correct errors of administration not connected with judicial proceedings, providing such suitable remedies as may be needed, (§§ 2 and 3, ¶ 215;) and (3) Where "the General Conference," in reviewing "the decisions of questions of law contained in the records and documents transmitted to it from the Judicial Conferences, in case of serious error therein, shall take such action as justice may require," (¶ 247.) It has for traveling preachers, other than bishops, three courts, besides the indefinite court already named. These are: court of investigation, court of trial, and court of appeal. The court of investigation, however, can hardly be called a court in the proper sense, though possessed, in a limited degree, of judicial functions; it being instituted to meet exigencies which may arise in the interim of an Annual Conference, a body which has no real judicial power save when in session.

The oversight of all administration is lodged in three classes of persons, who, in their official capacity, are designated to perform the duties assigned to each. These are, first, the Bishops, or General Superintendents; second, the Presiding Elders, or District Superintendents; third, Preachers in charge of Circuits or Stations. The jurisdiction and duties of a Bishop

are defined in ¶¶ 201 to 216, 242 to 244, and 248. These are: to convene and preside in a Judicial Conference called to try an accused Bishop; to preside in an Annual Conference at the trial of a traveling preacher, when tried before the whole body of the Conference; or to appoint a chairman to preside when tried before a select number; to appoint counsel for the Church and for the accused; to convene a Judicial Conference, and preside therein, in cases of appeal from the decisions of an Annual Conference; and to decide all questions of law presented in an appeal from the decisions of a Presiding Elder, made in an appeal case before a Quarterly Conference.

The jurisdiction and duties of a Presiding Elder are defined in the following paragraphs, and relate to four classes of cases. First, the appeal of a private member or local preacher to a Quarterly Conference, (¶¶ 219 and 251.) Second, proceedings against a preacher on trial, (¶ 218.) Third, proceedings against a traveling preacher, or other Presiding Elder, in the interim of an Annual Conference, (¶ 209, §§ 1 to 5, ¶¶ 211 to 215.) Fourth, proceedings against an accused Bishop, (¶¶ 201 to 203.)

The jurisdiction and duties of a preacher in charge are defined in ¶¶ 219 to 226, ¶ 227, §§ 1 and 2, ¶¶ 228 to 233, and ¶¶ 235 to 237. These paragraphs refer to proceedings for immorality, imprudent and unchristian conduct, insolvency, disagreement in business, non payment of debts, sowing dissension, neglect of the means of grace, and improper words and tempers. Their jurisdiction extends over local preachers, and official and private members.

The first class of offenses named consists of improper tempers, words, and actions, insolvency, non-payment of debts, sowing dissensions, neglect of the means of grace, disagreement in business, teaching heresy, buying, selling, or using intoxicating liquors as a beverage, or becoming in any way a participant in the traffic in intoxicating drinks, dancing, card-playing, horse-racing, attending theaters, circuses, dancing-parties—in a word, all such amusements as "cannot be taken in the name of the Lord Jesus." The second class consists of such offenses as are "expressly forbidden in the word of God, and sufficient to exclude a person from the kingdom of grace and glory."

The Church, while it makes it the duty of a Preacher in charge, a Presiding Elder, and a Bishop to see that the pro-

visions of the Discipline named in all these paragraphs and sections are carried out by each in the jurisdiction given him, does not give either of them any right to exclude from the Church until the persons charged, after trial by their peers, have been found guilty of the crimes alleged against them. The administrator, in no case, is the judge of the innocence or guilt of an accused person. He cannot even charge a committee which tries a case as a judge charges a jury in a civil court. The committee are the judges of both the *law* and the *evidence*, and the Church does not permit interference with their prerogatives. All an administrator can do is to see that a case is properly arranged and conducted, and rule upon motions for the admission or exclusion of proffered evidence. The only departure from this is where a preacher in charge "may differ in judgment from a majority of the committee concerning the guilt or innocence of the accused, he may refer the case to the ensuing Quarterly Conference, which shall have authority to order a new trial." A prerogative of doubtful expediency, and not at all in harmony with the general jurisprudence of Methodism. The Church decides upon the guilt or innocence of all who are arraigned for offenses committed against its laws and order. The verdict is pronounced by the peers of the accused in every case except that of an arraigned Bishop, and here also, if we look upon the episcopacy as an *office* and not an *order*—a view which most Methodists hold. The right of *peremptory* challenge is only given to accused Bishops, and to traveling preachers in cases of appeal to a Judicial Conference; but this extends only to a limited number. The court cannot be reduced below the minimum required by the law of the Church. The right to challenge for *cause* is given to private members, local preachers, and traveling preachers, in all preliminary investigations, but not in appellate courts. Such courts—being either the Quarterly Conference, the Annual Conference, or the Judicial Conference—are created by the organic law of the Church, and cannot be changed in their composition, like committees called together for an especial purpose. The Church grants the right of appeal to all, where errors and defects in judicial proceedings may be duly considered, and rectified if wrong, or affirmed if right. And beyond these appellate courts of the Church,

definitely named, there are the indefinite courts already alluded to, where errors of administration and serious errors in law may be remedied by "such action as justice may require."

It is seen by these provisions that the Church guards most sacredly the rights of all within its fold; while, at the same time, by the minute provisions made for proceedings against those guilty of the multiform and various offenses named, it also equally seeks to guard the integrity and purity of the Church.

There can be no doubt as to the duty of an administrator in relation to offenses so explicitly named. It matters not what his personal feelings may be, nor how much he may shrink from the performance of what must ever be a most disagreeable task; obligation binds him, responsibility rests upon him, and the gravity of his position as "an overseer of the Church of God" makes it impossible that he should evade his duty without incurring serious guilt. There are, however, some questions arising in connection with the discharge of these stern duties which are worthy of consideration. For instance: How far should an administrator insist upon regular investigation by Church courts of alleged immoralities or other offenses? Constant, or even frequent, litigation is very pernicious in its results; it distracts and demoralizes. We know something of its evil effects upon the character of those who indulge in it in our civil courts. Would not the effects be worse upon litigants in our Church courts? How, then, is an administrator to proceed in the discharge of his duty, so as to subserve the moral ends for which the Church exists? How is he to preserve its peace, secure moral benefit to the offender, uphold the righteousness and dignity of Church authority, saving it from any charge of laxness or connivance with offenders, and at the same time avoid the troubles which naturally grow out of litigation? It is evident that Church trials ought to be avoided, if they can be, without betrayal of trust or neglect of duty. If all men were honest, or even wise when honest, it would be different. There is likely to be misrepresentation. Sides will be taken, perhaps from prejudice, or sentiment, or interest, and not from reason, justice, the love of the Church, or the love of God. There will, in all probability, be evil passion engendered, and no one can predict what

may be the final outcome of evil. On the other hand, to even *seem* to wink at wrong, or to show the least indifference in reference to evident immorality, would be productive of still greater evil. There must not be room for even the *shadow* of a suspicion in this direction. Where, then, shall the line be drawn so as to avoid both of these evils? To carry out in their fullest measure the mandates of the Church, and at the same time avoid, as far as possible, the evils which arise out of wrong *when it arrays itself against the forces which seek to suppress it?*

I answer: Let the provisions of our Book of Discipline, in reference to the minor offenses, be faithfully and fully, yet prudently, carried out; and it is probable that, in a large majority of these cases, reformation can be secured, and the Church saved both the scandal and the trouble which grow out of litigation. In cases of the sterner immoralities, there should be no vacillating. Every rumor should have immediate attention, and such informal inquiry be made as will ascertain the grounds upon which it rests. If it appears, after such inquiry, that the rumor is false, let the result be known, and usually the case will be ended. If, on the other hand, there is a probability, or even a possibility, of guilt, or if it is not *absolutely clear* that the rumor is groundless, then let the administrator proceed to investigate the case according to the rules and provisions of the Church made and provided for such cases. No member of the Church, certainly no *minister*, can afford any other course. To shrink from investigation is tacit confession of guilt; and though the accused may escape expulsion from the Church by evading trial, yet he will not be exonerated in the eyes of his fellow-men, nor of the Church, nor will the administrator be guiltless of a betrayal of the sacred trusts committed to his keeping. The interests of the Church, the administrator, and the accused all demand that there be *immediate, thorough, and fearless investigation of every such case.* The solution of the difficult problem just named will find further answer in the consideration of my next general division, which is:

III. To define the qualifications and spirit which should characterize the true administrator in conducting all investigations coming under his jurisdiction.

The proper inquiry having been made, and the preliminary steps of arraignment all having been correctly, carefully, and prudently taken, the personal qualifications and spirit of the administrator will have much to do with results and their effects. The position in which he is placed is one of the most critical positions possible. He is intrusted with interests of the most delicate and important character, and surrounded with difficulties of the most subtle and sensitive kind. He is in the position of both a judge and a brother, and consequently occupies a near and delicate relation both to the accuser and the accused. The Church has intrusted him with the care of its honor, integrity, and purity. He pities the accused, and sympathizes with the innocent and blameless ones, who by the ties of kinship and friendship are so intimately associated with him, that their welfare and happiness is bound up in the verdict which may be given in the case. The welfare, too, on the other side, of perhaps deeply injured and wronged ones, and those near and dear to them, the welfare of the Church, and perhaps the eternal salvation of souls, is involved in the issue. With these opposite interests clamoring and appealing to his judgment and his heart; with self-interested, and sometimes wicked, persons seeking to influence him by raising false issues, in order to distract attention from the real issue; surrounded with smiles and frowns, praise and blame, flattery and censure, promises and threats, often alternating and seeking to move him, he certainly needs to be thoroughly panoplied for the ordeal.

Plato* classifies virtue as follows: The virtue of the *reason*, which is prudence, or wisdom; the virtue of the *heart*, which is valor; and lastly the virtue to which he says "belong the due regulation and adjustment of the other powers of the soul, and which, therefore, constitutes the bond uniting the three, which is *justice*." "In justice all the elements of moral culture meet together and center." Again he says: "God is angry when any one censures a man like himself, or praises a man of an opposite character; and the Godlike man is the *good man*." The administrator of the discipline *ought* to be possessed of all these virtues. *Wisdom* and *prudence* are indispensable to him. He will need *valor* of the highest order, daring, under any and all circumstances, to do right. And above all, he *must be* just.

* "Republic."

He ought, and he will, if he has the right spirit, typify in his character Plato's "Godlike man," and be possessed of what Charles Sumner calls "the true grandeur of humanity" when he says: "The true grandeur of humanity is in *moral elevation*, sustained and enlightened by reason, and that passionless, God-like justice which controls his relations with all others." No tincture of littleness or narrowness should show itself in his character. He must not be a partisan, nor allow prejudice to control him. Sympathy must be under the dominion of reason, and impartiality mark every movement. The old saying, "the judge is on the prisoner's side," must not be the rule which regulates him; he is to be on no side, or rather, on *all* sides. Standing as the representative of God's authority in the Church, he ought to cultivate and represent that dignity, impartiality, justness, tenderness, transparency, wisdom, courage, and love which inhere in and adorn the character of our Lord Jesus Christ. He ought to be possessed of all the platonic virtues, and more, of the Christian virtues also. If it were possible, he ought to be as wise as Solomon, as just as James, as prudent as Paul, as brave as Peter, as tender as John, and as *immovable from right* as the "Rock of Ages," and, like the symbolic representations of justice, *blind* to *every thing* but truth, right, and the eye of God. Such a character, who can find? Such perfections, alas! are only ideal, and never can be fully realized in fact. Yet notwithstanding this, every administrator should strive, as nearly as possible, to reach this ideal. He can be possessed of the spirit, and be guided by the intent thereof, even when he falls greatly short of its realization. Knowing "no man after the flesh," let him preside as reflecting in his administration God's qualities, and above all, "*that passionless God-like justice*" which is the band that ties in one the bundle of all the virtues.

I now come to the most important part of this discussion—indeed, all-important, if the results aimed at by the Church in its administration of the discipline are rightly reached, or even reached at all, namely:

IV. To define the manner in which a Church court should be conducted, and to discuss the application of the principles and rules of evidence prevailing in civil courts to ecclesiastical courts.

How is an administrator to elicit the truth in reference to the guilt or innocence of an accused party, and thus secure justice in administration? This is a vital question. He may be just and upright; his intentions may be the purest and best; he may have many of the qualifications, and be possessed fully of the spirit, already described, and yet so conduct an investigation or trial as to defeat the ends of justice, rather than attain them. It is very important that all the preliminary steps shall have been carefully and correctly taken. The requirements of our Book of Discipline should be fully complied with, even to the minutest details, in this respect. The charges and specifications under them ought to be carefully and correctly drawn. Each charge should be specific; each specification definite, and under its appropriate charge; the committee secured; due notification given the accused of time and place of trial; ample time given him to secure counsel and prepare his defense; sufficient time allowed to both complainant and defendant, to take depositions, secure witnesses, and do any other thing which may be necessary to the thorough investigation of the complaints.

When every thing is thus ready, and the investigation begins, *the administrator must see that the case is conducted according to the forms of law and that the tests of relevancy and truthfulness are applied to all the testimony offered;* applying strictly the principles and rules of evidence prevailing in civil courts *to the case in hand.* I know that this is not the view taken by the Church generally. Perhaps a majority—certainly a large number—of its administrators hold that these principles and rules should not be strictly adhered to, *but* that all rulings on the admission of offered evidence should be what is called *liberal*—whatever that term may mean, (as indefinite here, doubtless, as it is when applied to theology;) that there should be a "broad margin" given, as to the character of witnesses, kind and relation of evidence, charactor of questions, etc. In support of this view, it is said, it is impossible to apply the rules of evidence to cases before ecclesiastical courts, or conduct them as civil courts are conducted, because the Church has no power to compel the attendance of witnesses, and administers no oaths. Not, therefore, using the forms, nor possessing the powers, of a civil

court, greater latitude must be given, and the facts gained by gleaning them from and sifting them out of whatever may be proffered or produced, whether true or false, relevant or irrelevant, to the issue relating or not relating to the case in hand. The *sorting process* implied in this position is the point of its weakness. He who would be able to separate the true from the false, under such circumstances, would be possessed of an insight almost amounting to *omniscience.* And yet such views are somewhat general, and our Church practice largely corresponds to them; and because of this, our Church courts are so frequently charged with "whitewashing" offenders, and are reckoned by many untrustworthy, failing to command, as they should, the respect of the intelligent and thinking public. This "wide margin" theory is a delusion. The fallacy of the position will be seen upon a moment's reflection. In granting it the question naturally arises, How wide? Do away with all limitations? ignore all tests? admit every thing that is offered as evidence? allow every question which may be asked? *No one will be absurd enough to claim this.* Well, then, where shall the line be drawn? It must be drawn somewhere; where shall it be? Is it not better to leave it where the experience of men who have made the methods of eliciting truth a special study have placed it? Is it probable that any one can do better than this? Is there not an unwarranted assumption of wisdom in setting one's self up as wiser than the aggregate wisdom of the many, gained by hundreds of years of experimenting in reference to the same thing? Ought any *one* man be permitted to assume such prerogative, much less be assisted in taking it upon himself? It is an assumption unwarranted in any view of the case. There will be points enough arise, as we shall see farther on, where an administrator will be forced to apply principles of evidence in his discretion, without assuming to set aside or ignore those well-established rules, which are every-where reckoned the *safeguards of virtue and the tests of truth.* The reasons given for a departure from the practice of civil courts are, when properly considered, reasons why, if there should be any difference, the rules of evidence should be more strictly applied in ecclesiastical than in civil courts. Because the Church cannot compel the attendance of witnesses, nor secure their testimony except

they choose to give it, nor administer oaths, it is therefore under the greater obligation to be careful as to the character of those who do testify, and to protect them and all concerned from attacks which, from the nature of a Church court, they may not be able to repel. Any other course can only be of advantage to the unscrupulous. They, and not the honest and truthful, would take advantage of this liberality in administration, and put in irrelevant and false testimony under it; while the just, being unable to secure the attendance of witnesses, perhaps, and being precluded by *conscience* from meeting it on its own plane, *would be at the mercy of the vile.* Our Church courts would thus become agencies to hurt the good, instead of agencies to protect the Church and punish evil-doers. No just person could ever be benefited by such administration. All legitimate evidence—all that is necessary for the ascertainment of *truth* and *fact*—can be brought forward without the least departure from the rules of evidence contained in the common law and equity. Nay, more, an adherence to them is necessary to the ascertainment of truth and the protection of all parties from the dangers of false testimony; they are equally just to all, and the surest means known of detecting and preventing such testimony..

It is the duty of every administrator to become familiar with the methods of civil courts. He ought to make himself master of the rules of evidence, especially the principles upon which they are based. As truth is more certainly attained by the use of logical methods than in disregard of them; as they are absolutely necessary to the success of argument and the detection of fallacy; so the methods of our civil and criminal courts are necessary to the attainment of justice before ecclesiastical tribunals. The rules of evidence contained in the common law are the result of centuries of investigation and experiment as to the best methods of eliciting truth. They are the product of experience, and the conclusions of the ablest and most learned jurists of the world. The ground of their necessity lies in the *infirmity of the human mind*—its inability to avoid confusion amid a multitude of issues. The best disciplined minds among men, those trained to the closest thought, have ascertained that in the pursuit of truth it is *absolutely* necessary to hold the mind to *singleness of issue*, and exclude

from it all irrelevant and extraneous matter. There is but a single issue in any trial before a Church court; namely, the guilt or innocence of the accused in reference to the offenses charged against him. An unscrupulous counsel will seek to shift the issue, and by so doing confuse the court and jury, by calling their attention away from the real issue to some person not on trial, and some issue not involved in the case. An administrator must prevent this, holding all parties strictly to the case in hand, excluding every thing irrelevant.

In a sister Church, it is said, there actually occurred the following case, highly illustrative of the importance of the point just named. A pastor preferred charges against a member of his church for the crime of theft, of which he was clearly guilty. A neighboring pastor was called in to preside at the trial. The defense, instead of trying to show innocence, assailed the character of the pastor who brought the charges, accusing him of all kinds of misdemeanors, and bringing forward disreputable persons to prove them. He protested, claiming that he was not on trial; that the question before them was not what he might or might not be guilty of, but whether the accused was guilty or innocent of the crime charged against him. He insisted that, if he had committed the offenses claimed, that charges should be preferred against him in a proper way, where and when he could meet and answer them; that now the question was not his *guilt or innocence*, but that of the *other man*. The president of the court ruled that ecclesiastical courts should be conducted with great liberality of procedure! that in them accused and accuser came face to face; both were before the Church, and *on trial*. The result was, that one clearly guilty escaped, and the good name of an innocent party was clouded, through the ignorance of an administrator, ignoring, as he did, the plainest principles of evidence and the dictates of common sense. The notion that a Church court ought to be conducted upon the *broad* and *liberal* idea so generally prevailing is a *delusion of the worst kind*, and, in nine cases out of ten, will not only needlessly and indefinitely prolong investigation, but *defeat the ends of justice*.

But it may be said, Trials conducted in this way give better satisfaction to the general public, who, knowing nothing about the principles of evidence, will be dissatisfied if the case is held

strictly to them. I reply, If the object of a Church court is to *please the people* more than to *elicit the truth*, the point is well taken. But is that the object? Is that what Church trials are for? Is there no higher motive than this? Does not the objection rest upon a moral plane so low that it is unworthy of a moment's thought? Is it not better to please *God* than *men?* What would be thought of a civil court which should in all its proceedings have its hand upon the popular pulse, and act accordingly? Its work is to administer *justice*, regardless of the popular favor or disfavor. And shall the Church of the living God be less removed from such influences? Nay, verily! When in the discharge of the high and holy duties of the administration of the Discipline it panders to popular clamor, it will have ceased to *deserve* the confidence of mankind, and will soon reach the point of its deservings.

The administration of Discipline should not, however, be confined to a quibbling adherence to mere technicalities; this is an extreme to be avoided as well as the opposite. It is a well-established principle of our ecclesiastical jurisprudence, that no technical informality nor hair-splitting quibbling shall be permitted to interfere with the ascertainment of truth, or stand in the way of justice. Geikie,* speaking of the disgusting adherence of the Jewish rabbis to the minute technicalities of the "traditions of the elders" at the time of our Saviour, says: "A system which admitted no change, in which the least originality of thought was heresy, which required the mechanical labor of a life-time to master its details, and which occupied its teachers with the most trifling casuistry, could have but one result, to degenerate to a great extent into puerilities and outward forms." The same thing is true of a rigid adherence to minute technicalities anywhere and in any thing. Lading the memory with fine points of detail usually enfeebles the understanding, rendering its decisions more or less untrustworthy. A Church court laden and bound fast with a great mass of technicalities would be as puerile as a court of rabbis. Avoid technicalities, but in doing so do not ignore those rules which are not merely technical, but are *God's sign-boards of reason*, which point the way to the truth, and whose directions we *must follow* if we ever arrive at it.

* "Life of Christ."

In the progress of a trial there will frequently points arise where the administrator must be guided by the nature of the case, and his judgment as to the course he should take. The application of principles of evidence at such times is discretionary, and must be determined by all the circumstances of the case. It is at points of this kind he needs the greatest wisdom, and should proceed with the greatest deliberation and care. There can be no definite rules given to guide him at such points. His own good judgment, personal insight, common sense, and intuition of right, aided by the enlightenment which God gives to the sincere seeker for it, must be his guides. A distinguished authority* has said, "The absolute criterion of the correctness of our conviction of duty is a feeling of truth and certainty." This accords with the theory that conscience is the "eye of the reason" † by which we recognize the intuition of right and wrong; the ought and ought not; and, when enlightened by the judgment, not only recognizes that there is a *right* and a *wrong*, but *what* is right and *what* is wrong. Without indorsing or denying this "philosophy," it is safe to say such study of a case as recommended would so enlighten the "*feeling* of truth and certainty," that what it dictated would perhaps be right, at least as nearly right as it is possible to ascertain under such circumstances and in such cases.

But, aside from the exceptions named, an unswerving adherence to the well-established rules of evidence will be still more clearly seen by calling attention, a little more fully than hitherto, to the following three important points: (1) The competency and character of witnesses. (2) The grounds upon which certain questions are allowed or prohibited in the direct and cross examination of witnesses. (3) The quality and relativeness of testimony. The common law recognizes several things as rendering witnesses incompetent. Defect of understanding, defect of a sense of moral obligation, and defect from infamy of character, all render them incompetent to give testimony in courts of justice. Defect of understanding may arise from insanity, idiocy, or immaturity—intoxication being defined as a species of insanity. Defect of a sense of moral obligation arises from a lack of religious belief, and of a conviction of

* Fichte. † Calderwood.

moral accountability to God. Defect from infamy of character may be either infamy in the eye of the law or infamy in fact. Infamy in the eye of the law arises from a conviction by a court of justice for the commission of certain crimes. A conviction for forgery, perjury, subornation of perjury, bribing a witness to absent himself, or for conspiracy to accuse another person of a capital crime, all render witnesses incompetent. Infamy of character is usually set down against the credibility of a witness. In Church courts it ought to render them incompetent, because of the reasons already given, and also because of the *superior dignity and purity of the Church.* There is a difference between the common law and the statutes of some of the States as to the competency of certain testimony. The common law, as a rule, does not allow one charged with crime to testify in his own behalf, while the statutes of several States, at least, make him competent so to testify. Ought the Church to follow the common or the statute law? Possibly, for prudential reasons, it may be best to follow the practice of the courts in the localities where we reside; at the same time, the best minds who have given the subject the thought it deserves are fully convinced of the superior wisdom of the common law in this respect. Neither the cause of truth or justice has been served by the other practice. The plea of guilty or not guilty covers the whole ground, and no testimony from an accused person will add any thing to this plea. The common law practice, in my judgment, ought to be the practice of our Church courts, with the added exclusion of witnesses who are infamous in fact, though they may not be so in law. The Church is the earthly representation of God's eternal kingdom; its government, therefore, ought to be a reflex of the divine government, and its dignity and purity in all things duly considered and protected. Hence no person of acknowledged bad moral character should be competent to bear witness in its courts. No self-convicted debauchee, no person convicted of the commission of grave crime, no one expelled from its folds for falsehood or other gross immorality, should ever be permitted to testify before its tribunals. Expulsion from the Church debars from Church privileges. If the expulsion has been for falsehood or other gross immorality, the expelled person stands in the same relation to the Church that one

convicted of perjury or other grave crime stands to the civil court, and, by the law of analogy, is incompetent to testify in the courts of the Church.

Questions asked witnesses by counsel or committee are frequently necessary to get out the real points of testimony upon which the prosecution or defense rely. The direct and cross examination of witnesses, therefore, is an inalienable right; but the rule prohibiting a leading question in direct examination is based upon grounds of equal reason with those of examination itself. Such questions are equivalent to putting words into the mouth of a witness, and justly chargeable with attempt to manufacture testimony for the occasion. For this reason they are prohibited. But to offer suggestions, in order to assist the memory of a witness, is not only allowable, but highly proper, because often necessary to enable the witness to call up that which, though important, would otherwise, because of the treachery of the memory, be passed over and lost. In cross examination leading questions are admissible, because they may be necessary to bring out some point which the witness is trying to conceal, or to show the animus of the witness toward the opposite party. All questions asked upon cross-examination must bear the tests of being responsive to the examination in chief, and relevant to the issue. Were it otherwise, endless issues might be raised, unlimited time consumed, private right invaded, and the dignity of a solemn court turned into a burlesque of justice. For the same reasons no new matter can be introduced upon cross-examination. If there is something the opposite side desire the witness to state, which has not been stated in the direct testimony, let the party make the witness his own, or bring the evidence out through some other witness. No witness can be called upon to answer a question which would criminate himself in such a manner as to expose him to legal penalty, and an administrator ought to protect him against all attempts to induce him to do so; if he is a competent witness, he has a right to such protection; if incompetent, he ought to be ruled out. When a witness, through regard for the accused, or out of respect for the welfare and purity of the Church, voluntarily comes forward and gives testimony, the Church owes him protection. And while his testimony ought to be subject to all the rules of testing known in civil courts,

nothing beyond this, upon the plea that there should be greater breadth and liberality in ecclesiastical courts than in civil, should be permitted.

The impeachment of a witness is also an inalienable right, because necessary sometimes to self-protection; but it should never be permitted save in one, or both, of the two ways recognized in the common law. That is, by showing the general reputation of the witness for truth and veracity to be bad; or by showing that the witness has made statements outside of the court different from, or contradictory of, those made in it. The foundation for impeachment in the latter of these two ways must be laid in the cross-examination of the witness, by calling his attention to the time, place, attending circumstances, and person to whom such contradictory statement was made. The reason for this is, that while one may be supposed to be always able to defend his general reputation, he may not be able to defend his reputation in a special case unless he has his attention called to all the particulars connected with it. For this reason, if there has been no such foundation laid, the law does not permit any attempt to impeach in that way, or questions upon outside matters which are not contradictory of the direct testimony, or irrelevant to the issue. A member of our Church ought to be liable to impeachment, as well as one who is not. There is no good reason why all witnesses should not equally be subject to the same testings. The cause of truth and justice demands it.

As to the quality and relativeness of testimony, a part has already been anticipated. The rules relative to hearsay, relevant and irrelevant; parole and written; matters of public interest; husband and wife; co-conspirators; dying declarations; declaration of agents, *res gesta;* burden of proof; substance of the issue; presumptive and direct evidence, are as applicable to ecclesiastical as to civil courts, and ought to be adhered to by the administrator of the Discipline as strictly as by a judge in a civil or criminal court. That he may do so, the Rules of Evidence, by some recognized authority, ought to be in the course of study prescribed for our preachers; and none should be graduated without mastering them any more than they should be without mastering our "Standards of Theology" and "Church Economy."

I come now to the closing division of this subject, the foundations for which have been laid in the preceding divisions:

V. To show that our ecclesiastical courts may become the most reliable of all courts, the surest in eliciting truth and rendering verdicts which will command the approval of honorable and thinking men.

The reliability of the decrees of any court depends upon the extent into which the following elements of certainty have entered into its investigations.: (1) Legality of form and order in the indictment, or complaint. (2) Legality of procedure in the investigation of the complaint. (3) Singleness of *issue* in the contest between the parties to the suit. (4) Reliability and truthfulness of testimony, because of the good character of witnesses. (5) That the verdict is the verdict, not of *one*, but of *several* persons. (6) That a full, *written* record of the testimony be kept, so that it can be examined carefully, point by point, by the jury or committee at their leisure. (7) General intelligence and special legal training of the court and jury. (8) Incorruptible integrity, accompanied by the solemnities and sanctions of a personal religious faith and sense of responsibility to God on the part of both court and jury. These elements, in some degree, at least, would enter into a Church court if conducted in the manner already described.

Let the complaint be explicit and definite, containing no side issues or unimportant matter. Let each charge, and the specifications under it, definitely state the offenses, when and where committed. Many a cause has failed, both in civil and in Church courts, because of serious defect in the complaint. Many Church trials have proved unsatisfactory, or entirely failed, because of clumsiness in drawing the charges, and in loading down the case with trifling issues.

One defect in the verdicts of our civil courts, especially the verdicts of juries, rendering them more or less unreliable, is the utter inability of the human mind to retain in memory all the points in a large mass of conflicting testimony—a defect which the courts now quite generally are seeking to remedy by the employment of stenographers. The writer just quoted puts the case in the following clear and strong language: "To carry all the evidence of a long trial in the mind is a thing few men can do with the training of a life-time. In a cause which

has a large mass of conflicting testimony it is an impossible thing, even for the most able and experienced judges, to give sound decisions on mere matters of fact without having the exact record of the witnesses' words, copies of the papers, and, above all, *time* to read and think."

As if anticipating this defect of civil courts, as well as the possibilities of an appeal, our Church requires an exact copy of all the proceedings and testimony in the case to be taken down in *writing*, so that a committee can carefully examine it at their leisure, and ascertain exactly what the testimony is upon any point which may be in doubt; thus refreshing the memory, enlightening the judgment, and rendering its decisions trustworthy.

As to intelligence, a Church committee of five laymen, selected, as they should be, and usually are, for their intelligence and sound judgment, will in this respect greatly outrank the best juries in our civil courts; while a committee of ministers, either in a preliminary investigation before a Presiding Elder's court, a select number at an Annual Conference, or as a Judicial Conference, constitute a jury whose general intelligence is unequaled save by a bench of trained lawyers when acting as judges in an Appellate or Supreme Court. It is safe to assert that there is no class of men of superior general intelligence, or with better trained and disciplined minds anywhere, than these. The breadth and variety of their general culture, the critical training that comes from theological and philosophical study, the habit of observing nice distinctions and scanning close points, render them eminently qualified to sift, weigh, and apply evidence. If, in addition to this, we add the mastery of the fundamental principles of law and evidence, then, if such a court is not thoroughly prepared for the intelligent performance of its work, it would be hard to find one in the world that is.

But there is a still more important element than intellectual qualification, which enters into the trustworthiness of the verdicts of courts and juries. That element is integrity, backed by a religious conviction of responsibility to God for the justness of the verdict. This, above every thing else, renders such decisions worthy of confidence. When men act from profound convictions of duty, with the fear of God and the solemnities

of the judgment before their eyes; *they do only what they believe to be right*, and when that conviction is supported by intelligence and the other safeguards named, its decisions amount to as nearly a certainty as is possible in this fallible world. Every court of the Methodist Episcopal Church is supposed to be composed of such men: men of integrity and of profound convictions of duty and responsibility; men who have the vows of God upon them, and act as in his sight; who in their daily lives are in constant association with things good and pure; many of them engaged in the most holy of all callings—the Christian ministry. If there are pure, honest, God-fearing, good, and true men, these men ought to be, and, with rare exceptions, are. There can be only two grounds of danger that the verdicts of such men may not be just and right, and these have respect to their virtues and not their vices. The first of these arises from the *unsuspectingness* which belongs to unfamiliarity with crime. The difficulty which such persons have of conceiving how men can be as vile as they sometimes are, arises from the fact, that "to the pure all things are pure." "Charity thinketh no evil;" and because it does not, such persons will be slow to believe evil. They must see it before they can or will condemn it. We may, therefore, be sure that there will not be, with them, a readiness to convict without the strongest evidence of guilt. The second ground of danger arises from the spirit of sympathy with the sorrowing and troubled, which, belonging to Christ, is the spirit of Christians. But these are only seeming dangers. They are fully balanced by intelligence and sincerity, and by that sense of responsibility and of accountability to God which will not permit, however painful, sympathy to override justice or crime when clearly seen to go unpunished. Indeed, these elements of supposed weakness are really elements of strength, rendering the decisions, when made, all the more reliable; because they show us that sympathy prevents injustice being done to the accused, while the sense of responsibility prevents sympathy from overriding justice.

Take, then, in conclusion, these great facts and points which I have been discussing in this article and put them together.

1. The fact that there is both natural and divine authority in the Church to exclude the unworthy, and that he whom

the Church selects to exercise this authority is acting, when exercising it, under the double sanction of both human and divine authorization; and is, therefore, not only the *Church's agent*, but *God's minister* to do this very thing, surrounded with a dignity and clothed with a power the highest earth can know.

2. The fact that the Church by its law points out the limits of the jurisdiction it delegates to him, and the powers it confers upon him, defining his duty in each several case clearly and explicitly.

3. The point that he should, as far as possible, be possessed of the spirit of wisdom, prudence, valor, and justice, already pointed out, having, as a crown over all human endowments, "the wisdom that cometh from above."

4. The point that the case to be tried, after being carefully prepared and exact in all its points, be inquired into according to the principles of investigation already discussed, and by such committees as our Book of Discipline designates, and *nothing can compare with such administration in dignity, wisdom, purity, and certainty of righteous result.* It ought to, and would, command the respect, approval, and admiration of the world.

There can no good reason be given why such results may not be reached in our administration, and the Methodist Episcopal Church become "a terror to evil-doers," as well as a "praise to them that do well." A government which permits its laws to be violated with impunity, becomes contemptible in the eyes of its own citizens, and loses the respect of the governments of the world. If the Methodist Episcopal Church is to retain the respect of its own members, and command the respect of other Churches, it must show that it has value as a system, and the power and the will to preserve its own purity by administering discipline, intelligently, kindly, and yet with a firm hand upon the violators of its laws within its own pale, and around its own altars.

ART. VI.—THE PROBLEM OF OUR AFRICAN POPULATION.

IN our July number we discussed some "remarkable problems" of the population of the United States as presented by M. Simonin, in the "Bulletin" of the Geographical Society of Paris; facts which he pronounces "the most noteworthy, in geographical, economic, and moral phenomena" ever brought out by the statistics of nations. The results of this discussion were, summarily, the following: (1) That the "center of population" moves westward at the rate of fifty miles per decade (2) That, while the center has thus advanced at the rate of about five miles a year, the vanguard and flanks of the movement—in a line 1,200 miles long, as the bird flies, from the Lakes to the Gulf—advanced at the mean rate of seventeen miles a year, until the gold discoveries on the Pacific coast broke up the comparative regularity of the movement and dispersed it over the whole west of the continent. It had been, as Sir Charles Lyell said, "a continuous, a grand and solemn march" of humanity over the New World; felling the forests, planting the prairies, and founding the institutions of civilization. (3) That our population doubles in periods of from twenty-five to twenty-eight years. (4) That in about seventy years, that is to say, within the life-time of some thousands of our children, it will equal the whole present population of Europe, on a territory more than equal to that of Europe—a fact which must have most important effects on the commercial, social, political, and military relations of the two great sections, that is to say, on the whole civilized world. It will be equivalent to what would be the case were a single European State, say Germany, to have sway over all Europe, its "flag waving from the North Cape to Malta, from Lisbon to Moscow, over a population homogeneous in all vital respects, all freemen, and all speaking the same language. The fact of such a result is, in itself, startling; the fact of its *proximity* renders it doubly startling." In about eighty years the population of the United States will be more than seventy millions greater than the present population of Europe, according to M. Simonin's formula, and some of our children will see that time.

(5) The movement of the "center of population" will be completed, according to M. Simonin, and "all the surface of the immense country be filled with inhabitants," in about three hundred years—at most three hundred and twenty—a period which, though apparently distant to us fast Americans, seems near to him; it is as to-morrow in the history of nations. (6) Before this consummation, and as early as the year 2050, our population will be 800,000,000. "This," remarks M. Simonin, "is more than *double* all the population of Europe, including Russia; it is the figure which was given, at the beginning of this century, for the population of the *whole earth*." (7) But the result he reaches at the completion of the center movement—within three hundred and twenty years—is still more startling, not to say absolutely incredible; namely, that our population will then amount to 1,600,000,000; that is to say, a hundred millions more than the whole present population of the planet!—a hundred and sixty-six millions more, according to the latest and best German estimate of the population of the globe. The requisite period is not farther from us in the future than the conquest of Mexico, by Cortez, is in the past. It is but about fifty-seven years more than have elapsed since the arrival of the "Mayflower" at Plymouth. (8) But, what is more relevant to our present purpose, M. Simonin, in common with other European thinkers, points to two other very interesting and very grave facts in our national statistics, namely, that though the Negro population has no aid from immigration, yet its rate of increase is greater than that of the whites, which has such immense accessions from abroad; and, secondly, the startling fact that, in about eighty-one years, it will be larger than our whole population at the last census.

Such is a rapid summary of the calculations presented in our former article; they are assuredly of surpassing interest, and justify the attention given them by M. Simonin's European *confreres*, and the questions they have propounded to him respecting the probability of a future reflex emigration from the New to the Old World; the possibility of new fields for emigration, especially in the great *terra incognita* of Africa; and, finally, the fate of the world itself with a prospect of such a repleted population.

When we proposed to return to the subject, it was not with

the hope of saying anything much more satisfactory than we have already said on its problems, but of emphasizing some of its practical corollaries. For personal reasons we must, at present, resist the temptation to do so; but we must be allowed briefly to refer again to the future of our African population, a problem which is so proximate, so startling, and, as some writers think, so menacing. As to the problem of the general population of the globe, as affected by the immense American growth, we may leave that to the Malthusians and their opponents; it is so distant, and subject to so many contingencies—which have thus far historically affected it—wars, famines, pestilences, etc.—that few of us would contemplate it with much solicitude. It is a relief to us, also, to learn from the statisticians that, if our own population should be as dense, per square mile, as that of some of the agricultural districts of India, we are able, alone, to accommodate about three times the present population of the globe.

Our colored population is now found to be a great element of the working force of the nation, and is constantly becoming a better one; it deserves well of the republic for worthy conduct generally, and especially in critical times of our history. We have given it, theoretically, at least, liberty and political equality; but it has not social equality, for the latter does not depend entirely on political equality, though it may be profoundly affected by it. Our African population is still a social *caste*, and seems destined to continue such. The mark of that caste is on its very brows, as we have admitted in our former article; and, though only "skin deep," yet it is believed, by many of our own thinkers, at least, to be irremediable. Professor Gilliam, in treating elaborately the subject, (in the "Popular Science Monthly," February, 1883,) pronounces Amalgamation impossible, inconceivable. Professor Freeman, (the English historian,) who has studied it in his travels among us, points to the problem as one of the gravest perils of our future. The Parisian geographers look upon it as a "surprising" and formidable question. Are these well-deserving fellow-citizens to be forever a social *caste* among us? They are to be, as we have seen, within the life-time of some of our children, numerically equal to our whole present population—fifty millions and more; Professor Gilliam shows that, in 1980, they will be

one hundred and ninety-two millions. Can a republic go on prosperously with such a socially proscribed nation within the nation, and all these proscribed millions actual freemen, and politically equal to the race that socially disowns them? Can this Hindu pariah barbarism be successfully incorporated into our free institution, and Christian civilization? We unhesitatingly say No! Neither republicanism nor Christianity can admit such a supposition; and every fundamental law of national life is against it. And all good men should thank God that it is so.

Professor Gilliam insists that colonization is our *only* hope. We are not disposed to discourage this hope, though, in the presence of the formidable facts of the case, it seems altogether dubious. Geographers rank Africa as one of the great quarters of the earth; and it is fast becoming the chief field of modern exploration and commercial experiment. European enterprise is now attempting to penetrate it, at almost every point of the north, the west, the south, and the south-east, and to reach its very heart through the north-east by Egypt and Nubia. Livingstone, Stanley, De Brazza, and their coadjutors, have concentrated the attention of the world upon it; and the Congo would seem about to become one of the great thoroughfares of the globe. The "Dark Continent" is full of resources, of gold, iron, coal, ivory, precious woods, and gums, and the day for its corporation into the commercial system of the civilized world seems to have at last come. It may also be pronounced the greatest of all our remaining fields for philanthropic and religious zeal.

European thinkers now point to Africa as the next great field of colonization, after America; its proximity to Europe gives it special advantage in this respect, and it will not be surprising if the surplus population of the latter should be found, before many years, flowing toward it. The unhealthiness of parts of it would seem not to be an insurmountable obstacle. Geographers and geologists describe it as an inverted plate, with a low, malarious margin, or sea-board; and an inner, circular ridge of mountains inclosing most of the country as high and comparatively healthy plateaus, with inestimable resources. Several of the governments of Europe are now actively interested in its exploration and development. Is not

America to share, commercially, at least, this new interest for Africa? We, who have millions of people the best adapted to its climate—to be its sailors, pioneers, merchants, and missionaries—are we to be but idle spectators of the general movement for it? Are our growing millions of its children, rising daily in intellectual and moral improvement, to take no part in its redemption? With the immense prospective growth of our colored population will doubtless come considerable development of its business talent and wealth; in spite of its social disadvantages, can its fatherland fail then to attract its enterprise in commerce, in religion, and civilization generally?

It is not, therefore, improbable that the coming colored American hosts may look thitherward with an interest such as few of us now dream of; and if European emigration is hereafter to tend toward it, is it chimerical to suppose that the Americo-African race, with its scores of millions, will neglect the inviting field—its ancestral home?

We may well remind ourselves, in this connection, of the marvelous times in which we live, and their probable effect on the future. Events move now, not in arithmetical, but in geometrical, progression. Within our own still uncompleted century the world has advanced, in the scientific and practical arts, more than it ever advanced before in any recorded two thousand years. Our century has given it the steam-boat, the railroad, the telegraph, the telephone, the photograph, the spectroscope, anæsthetics, practical electricity, and how many other beneficent wonders! The above summary statistics of the New World are alone marvels portentous of revolutionary changes of the entire planet. Not he that hopes, but he that desponds over the prospects of the world, is now likely to be the false logician. As our Africo-American millions go on increasing, the world will also be hurrying on to new, and, perhaps, unthought-of, intersectional relations. Commercial steam navies will cover the seas; cheaper and more rapid communications will exist; and the transition from one to another portion of our little globe will become incredibly facilitated. May we not, then, with sufficient sobriety, expect that the African movement, now setting in, will affect the Africo-American problem? Europeans come now, by annual hundreds of thousands, to America to escape social and other disadvantages

of their native lands; and Africa is pointed to as their next great field of refuge. Can it be possible, we again ask, that our own African people, suffering the social disadvantages we have mentioned, will not share the general and ever-growing colonizing spirit, and claim their precedent right to the blessings of their fatherland?

Still, we look in this direction only for relief to the problem, not for its solution. Emigration to Africa, or anywhere else, must be voluntary with our colored population; no compulsion can now be thought of as either right or possible. Can we expect a voluntary expatriation of such millions? There is another line of thought, on which we may find further relief to the problem. While the movement of our Middle and Northern population is toward the West and North-west, that of the South tends to the West and South-west. Of course the black population must share the latter general movement; but it is said that there is already discernible a peculiarly strong tendency of the blacks in that direction. They appear to be unconsciously wending their way thitherward. Southern observers say so, at least. Even in the North, where there has been, since the civil war, a great diminution of prejudice against the race, and where hosts of philanthropic citizens stand ready to help it upward, it increases in but few places, and is gradually disappearing in many. Some of us expected it would overflow the North after emancipation; but, excepting a few western localities whither it has gone under a sort of sporadic and temporary impulse, its tendency has been south-westward. It is leaving Virginia, the old "breeding field" of the race; and all through the old Southern States, while it still multiplies there, it is reported that this tendency is bearing it along toward the Mexican frontier. Thither, too, tends inevitably the destiny of the nation. Beyond that frontier, and throughout Central and Southern America, exist millions of mixed populations, amalgamated Spaniards, Africans, and Indians. Our prejudices against amalgamation, wrongly affirmed, as we think, by Professor Gilliam, to be invincible are comparatively unknown among the masses, at least, of those vast and fertile regions. Is our African problem to find its solution there? Is nature, or rather Providence, opening thitherward the national destiny for our salvation and pro-

longed beneficent mission? We know how conjectural must be any such calculations, and how self-complacently criticism can brush them aside; but the history of humanity has much in it that our philosophy would never have dreamed of; there is a beneficent programme in things, whether we are willing theistically to account for it or not. Expecting death under the Reign of Terror, the atheistic philosoper, Condorcet, wrote an essay to prove the progressive "perfectibility" of the world —that by a natural law, an inherent system, the human race will go on to ever better conditions. The Christian thinker may still more confidently entertain this hope, especially in connection with so grand a destiny as that to which our country seems appointed. Few of us can doubt that our strongest future geographical tendency must be southward, perhaps indefinitely southward; and that our recent railroad and other business enterprises in that direction, particularly in Mexico, are opening the way for it. Meanwhile, what does this tendency of our black population thitherward mean? These people will there find not only a congenial climate, and most favorable conditions for their accustomed agricultural life, but they will find the native population, we may say, in a sense, the whole population, a mass of amalgamated races, including their own. Reaching the great new field, either by a special tendency of their own or the general tendency of our people, can they fail to intermingle with its mixed races? A similar amalgamation can begin only with the lower classes of population in any country; all the population of this vast, new field may be said to be of those classes. Mixing, as they naturally do in such circumstances, the distinctive and repulsive types, as of aboriginal or African, are more or less obliterated, or mingled in a new type of the working or common people, from whom, under free institutions like ours, rise at last the better classes of population; specific causes of prejudice against intermarriage, like that against the African, may thus die out. May we not, then, look with hope to the great Southern fields of the continent, which are to be the theater of our future national progress, for the solution of this Negro problem?

This view of the subject makes us, of course, "amalgamationists," though in a somewhat qualified sense; and we hesitate not a moment to accept that charge, notwithstanding

the emphatic language of Professor Gilliam, and similar very respectable writers, against amalgamation. We would not be unreasonable here, much less fanatical; but from broad views of humanity, as well as Christianity, we must insist on a treatment of the subject less liable to foster the antipathies of race than that which has prevailed among us. Though our religion is wisely not dogmatic on such subjects, unquestionably it repels at its very heart most of these prejudices. In most of foreign Christendom they are comparatively unknown; even in polished Paris, the American traveler finds them far less prevalent than in Boston or New York.

But it is on scientific grounds that we chiefly assert, contrary to prevalent opinion, that "amalgamation," and nothing but amalgamation, in some way or other, must be the final solution of the problem. This is certainly its only historical solution. No similar problem has been solved in any other way. England, France, Spain, modern Greece, have all homogeneous populations compounded of various races; the illustration is, we admit, but partial, for they are not exactly parallel cases; but in tropical and South America the amalgamation has been sufficiently parallel; and, whether parallel or not, is there any other historical or scientific solution to be offered us? If not, should it not be the aim of all thinkers, and of all good men among us, to diminish rather than fortify the prevalent prejudice against it?

It is often said that degeneration attends the intermarriage of blacks and whites, and there are wise men who would conscientiously oppose it on this ground. The opinion is a fallacy, founded nevertheless in an element of truth. It is contrary to the well-known laws and results of interbreeding. The mulatto may, indeed, be less physically vigorous than the pure African, but intellectually he is superior, and this implies an essentially superior type, with whatever incidental defects. He is in transition, and has, doubtless, some peculiar liabilities; but let the transition go on, and the superior blood is certain, soon or later, to work out superior results. His anomalous position amid our unchristian prejudices, depresses him in all respects; give him fair play and, like not a few of his class of late years, he, or at least his children, will soon reveal his superiority. The quadroon has been noted for beauty; and beauty belongs

to superior race. It is seldom found among savages. If we pass by the local anomaly of the Asiatic Georgians, (intrinsically, however, an intimate example of the Aryan race, and probably affected by peculiar local conditions,) beauty is a characteristic of advanced humanity; it distinguished the Greeks in the ancient world, as symbolized by their poets, in the person of Helen; the French in the modern world, symbolized in Madame Recamier; the Americans in recent times, if we may accept the concurrent opinion of foreign travelers among us. The blood of the white race in the quadroon doubtless contributes to the peculiar physique in which is founded her peculiar beauty; but, nevertheless, the Negro element is the distinctive fact of that beauty. We have certainly abused the Negro enough; let us be candid with him, at least within the limits of science, if we will not within those of religion and humanity. Let us not deny to him the benefits of its acknowledged laws. If we suppose ourselves incomparably his superior, and consider his race one of the lowest, yet what were our own British forefathers in the days of Cæsar's invasion, and what would we probably be to-day, had they, in their mud huts, their clothes of wild beasts' skins, and their universal brutality, been denied the benefit of the natural laws of improvement? Heredity is one of those laws which affects the intellectual and social as well as the physical condition of races. It has taken centuries for the British race to rise from its primitive inferiority; but it has risen to the supreme place among nations. Doubtless the Negro race, among us, has inherent natural disabilities, and no possible means can at once bring it up to the standard of advanced races; its immediate improvements must become hereditary; with fair play every successive generation will possess not only better advantages, but better hereditary capabilities for further advancement. And we doubt not that, under the auspices of our better times, its continuous development will be far more rapid than was that of our own British ancestry. Be that as it may, let us give it fair play here, in our glorious arena of the New World—here, where races, nationalities, complexions, and physiognomies should pass out of consideration, and humanity alone be recognized—humanity in its universal brotherhood, and its imprescriptable rights.

It would seem, indeed, that the popular, if not the scientific, mind of our times has been too much inclined to place the Negro in the very lowest degree of humanity, quite forgetting the Terra del Fuegian, the Patagonian, the New Zealander, and other still lower forms of the species. The African is considered as, in some peculiar sense, autochthonous, indigenous to the "Dark Continent,"—if not sprung from the very slime of its soil, yet from some of its brute occupants, probably from its monkeys, and it is apparently assumed that any mingling of foreign blood with his can only brutalize humanity, not humanize his supposed brutality. Ethnologists know, however, that if we except one or two local examples of peculiar degradation in Africa, there are other much inferior races of our poor humanity. They know, also, that in Africa itself the laws of interbreeding have been working out their usual salutary results on a scale of much greater magnitude than has been generally suspected; and demonstrating that the Negro is as capable as any other people of this natural process of improvement. The Semitic race, to which we owe so much, has long been extending its sway over, not only the northern coast, but the northern interior of the continent, reaching far southward, over the somewhat numerous communities of the great desert, and into the Soudan, and is tending fast toward the equator; not only reducing the native tribes under its control, but teaching them to read the Arabic; erecting mosques among them, superseding the native polytheism by the strict Mohammedan monotheism, marked though it may be by some traces of the old native superstitions. The Semitic race, while maintaining its characteristics throughout this vast region, mingles, nevertheless, its blood with the native blood; the daughters of Africa fill the households, the harems, of the superior race, and thus a new race, a Semitic-African race, is being raised up over a large portion of the continent. A similar amelioration is also going on over most of the eastern coast. Ethnologists have long known that the superior Negroes of south-eastern Africa, who have won the friendship and admiration of Livingstone, Colenso, etc., are the offspring of an amalgamation of the natives with a foreign race. The original Kaffirs were a people from the north-east, quite distinct from the Negroes; they have mingled with the latter and

raised up a new race admired by all travelers for their superior stature, their fine proportions, "supple," and even "elegant," says a French authority—their lighter color, yellow brown, their elevated and rounded foreheads, etc. Their idiom and their influence reach far beyond Kaffraria. Amalgamation has, certainly, not failed to show here the usual advantages of interbreeding.

Again, there extends over nearly the whole northern interior, from Nubia to the Atlantic, a remarkable example of the comparative elevation of the native race by amalgamation with a mysterious foreign people from the North-east, known as the Pouls, the "Reds," "forming," says a French ethnologist, "the dominant caste in all the states which were founded ages since in the valley of the Senegal, in that of the Niger, and in the basin of Lake Tchad." They founded the empire of Tekrour, reaching beyond Timbuctoo. They have assimilated the native population, have raised up an improved race of pale or red color, "with a shade of rhubarb;" their children are taught to read in schools; their faith is monotheistic; their features are "fine;" their lips are "thin;" they have "nothing of the Negro woolly hair," but their locks hang in long tresses on their shoulders;" their "noses are aquiline;" their figures "tall and straight." They are "very intelligent," combine in their industries, and work well in iron and tissues. They "show a decided taste for instruction;" they "cannot be held in slavery," etc. In fine, Africa itself presents, we repeat, on a broad scale, examples of the salutary effects of amalgamation, incontestable demonstrations that the Negro is susceptible, like all the rest of the human race, of the elevating effects of interbreeding.

That good and, in some respects, truly great man, the late Bishop Gilbert Haven, studied thoroughly the African race among us. He himself was of the best type of American character—or, at least, of what all genuine Americans should be—with a soul large, not only as his nation, but as his race. At heart Gilbert Haven was an amalgamationist. He knew the Negro well, for he traveled and labored in the South with heroic devotion. He did not believe the race could be forever a *caste* among us, and what prevention of a caste could he see but the blending of it with our other races? He came, not

only to esteem the African, as having some peculiar and admirable race-traits; but, at last, he came heartily to love him as a brother man, destined to good and great things, and worthy of such a destiny. He saw in the race the best social affinities, singular docility, rare facility for acquiring at least the elementary intelligence and habits of civilization, such as could prepare it for high and speedy hereditary development, great religiousness, subordination to government, so rare in undeveloped peoples, brave patriotism, soldierly capabilities, and the best human sympathies. His episcopal dignity could not prevent his fervent fraternization with the humblest black men, nor even a certain frank, not to say gallant, acknowledgment of the beauty and graceful capabilities of many of their women. After studying them, all over the South, he could never criticise Moses's choice of an Ethiopian wife; and he believed it quite possible that, some day or other, an American leader of the people might not hesitate to introduce one into the presidential mansion. We may smile at all this; but the future may have some new revelations for us little suspected at present. The "heresies" of great men in one age have often become the highest orthodoxy and sublimest convictions of another. What will be, what *must* be, the relative position of this race when, a few years hence, it shall be as numerous as our whole present population—when, in about a hundred years hence, it shall be, according to Prof. Gilliam's figures, nearly four times as great as all our present national hosts? What must be the elevation of many of its families in that time? Already it has given us some really able men, who have adorned our public life; with its advancement they will multiply to tens of thousands. There will be among them successful merchants, scholars, statesmen. Can we socially proscribe them then? What will their millions not be able to do with our politics? They can then control, at discretion, our greatest parties; they can rule the nation. They are already in our Legislatures, and worthily there. To the most sober calculation the time may not be distant when, in the balancing of parties, we shall have a nominee from among them for the Vice-Presidency of the republic. Many patriotic citizens, zealous for their elevation, would hail such a fact to-morrow; but the Vice-President may readily enough become President, as our history shows; and if

he is worthy of the one position, he ought to be of the other. And if an able colored statesman, a man of polished education and manners, should enter, by the call of the nation, the White House, with his educated wife and children, what would become of our Negro social proscription under such a political recognition? Where would our race antipathy take refuge? It must be thrown to the winds. We would find ourselves in a practical, a national, solecism, where we must stand before the world confounded, if not ridiculous. Evidently the two things cannot co-exist; and, evidently, the first of them is next to inevitable in our political future. Gilbert Haven will as inevitably be recognized, not merely as an apostolic bishop, whose humanitarianism was worthy of the highest ethics of his religion, but as a heroic prophet in our national Israel.

Speculate on the subject as we please, the essential facts of the question confront us in a manner entirely uncompromising. These people are enfranchised citizens; they are to become the millions we have above estimated—these are two clear enough facts. It is another certain fact that their social proscription cannot possibly co-exist with their future numerical and political importance. What, then, are we to do in the case? The solution of the problem must absolutely be either such as we have indicated, or these coming millions must be reduced to such subjection as existed under the old, oriental, barbaric despotisms, where alone history has recorded any long subjection and control of large socially proscribed "castes," unless in legalized slavery and ownership. Does any man think we can reduce these millions again to slavery? Or, on the other hand, can our republican and Christian civilization sink to the condition of the old, oriental despotism and barbarism? If any man could wish the latter, as our only salvation, in respect to this problem, yet there can be no such miserable hope for him; for no nation could, in one century, sink from our altitude to such a depth, and in about one century, as we have seen, our Negro population is to be several times as great as our whole present population. There can be no time, therefore, for this barbarous alternative. On the other hand, let us the rather believe, that the providential extension southward of our population and civilization, not to say our governmental autonomy—for this is not necessary in the argument—together with a grand moral

self-conquest of our prejudices, shall dispel alike our race antipathies and the perils of the problem.

So much for hypotheses on the question; we wish they could be something better than hypotheses, but we offer them only for what they are worth, and if any other pen should afford us a more satisfactory, a more hopeful, solution of the problem, we would gratefully give our dubious theorizings to the winds.

We have said that the subject presents occasions for "prophesyings," and even "preachments." There have been enough of the former, in our treatment of it, thus far; we have no disposition to indulge in the latter, but may be allowed to add a few practical remarks in conclusion.

What should be our conduct, as citizens, before this formidable problem?

First. All political grievances of our colored people should be extinguished. The constitutional amendments have made them citizens and given them political equality with the whites, and the national Constitution is, as Judge Black affirmed, tacitly, an integral part of the organic law of the individual States; nothing in the latter can legally contradict the former, and any thing that does so, as regards the colored man, should be effectually negatived. It is not here a relevant question whether the constitutional amendments were wisely made, or could not have been more wisely made. Good citizens, good friends of the enfranchised African, may differ on that point. Personally we believe they were wisely made, and that nothing short of them could have been wisely done at the time. Reservations, which some thinkers suggest as having been expedient, and more appropriate to future opportunities, might never again find such opportunities, and might have remained eternal and insurmountable subjects of political agitation and peril. We rejoice, therefore, in the *fait accompli* of the enfranchisement of the American colored man. It is a legitimate evolution in the history of our civilization; and what now devolves upon us is the duty of maintaining it in its fullest integrity. All local laws that, in spirit, contravene it should, we repeat, be swept away. They should be no more tolerated against the black man than against the Teuton or the Celt. There are remnants of such laws; some of them, if they do not directly oppose liberty of marriage, impose at least dis-

advantages on the descent of property in marriages between blacks and whites. There are even disparagements of African citizens retained in the regulations of the national army, against which they have strongly protested in a late public convention. Evidently the best policy toward a people so prospectively important is to leave them the least possible grievance to complain of, the least possible motive for race combination, or for separate political organization in self-defense. It is especially important that the Southern States should follow this liberal policy. Already the blacks have large majorities in some of them. Professor Gilliam's statistical tables show that, before long, these majorities will be absolutely overwhelming. Superior intelligence and social power may enable the whites to guide political events there for some few years, but the advancing education of the blacks will afford them able leaders of their own color, and then race grievances will be sure to come into play in party movements. "The best solvent of political problems is liberty," says a great writer. Take away public grievances if you would prevent public disturbances. Our government started with perfect religious liberty. The result has been that, while every cabinet of Europe is more or less embarrassed by ecclesiastical problems, ours has probably never had any such problem before it for ten minutes. European radicals come among us in hosts, and, for a time, declaim their opinions, hold conventions, and have, in some cases, organized their socialistic communities. In Europe they would have been oppressed, perhaps suppressed; here they have had full liberty to experiment their whims, and the experiment has usually converted them (the most of them, at least, if not the demagogical leaders) into sober, practical citizens, seeking to make their individual fortunes, and to maintain the individual rights of property. No new political party could seriously disturb the American public mind, or even long exist, without a more or less sound and intelligible *raison d'etre.* But there could hardly be a more valid reason for public agitation and peril than race grievances imposed upon a large class of citizens having equal constitutional rights. Let the colored citizen, then, have fair play in the politics of the country; let him have no grievances to complain of, and we believe he will be as patriotic as any other race under its flag. Let him have as

perfect eligibility to public office, under good civil-service rules, as any other citizen; his promotion in this respect will tend to elevate the status of his race, and that elevation can only be a public advantage. In other words, color—whether white or red, black or yellow—should be incognizable before the laws of the republic.

Second. We should put away, as far as possible, our social, as distinguished from political, disparagements of the colored citizen. Free as we may personally be from such social prejudice, we would not impair the influence of what we wish to say on this subject by inconsiderately attacking the contrary sentiments of the reader. As Sir Roger de Coverly used to say on all doubtful or delicate questions, "There is much to be said on both sides of the subject." *De gustibus non est disputandum;* and the prejudices of men are as imprescriptible as their natural rights. No positive law in the Church or the State can be relied on as effectively corrective of the social antipathies against the Negro. But there is stronger law than positive legislation; there is the "higher law," the moral law, of public conscience, which can be arrayed in voluntary opposition to local or personal wrong opinion. It is this law that we would invoke in the present case. It was invoked against the old slave-trade, and swept it from the seas by taking on, at last, the power of legislation; it was, later, invoked against slavery itself, and swept it from the British Colonies and from the United States. Can it not now sweep away most, if not all, our race antipathies, and clear the national field for the free development of this depressed, this much-wronged, people? In the more intimate relations of life some of these antipathies may yet long linger among us, but should not our political ethics, should not our religion, should not our patriotism, (especially in presence of the problem we have been discussing,) inspire the whole nation with a determination to ameliorate, as far as possible, the social proscription which we yet impose upon this race, and on this race alone? There will always be social discriminations in any society. The "political equality" of men, declared by the American fathers, does not imply the extinction of such discriminations, though the doctrine continually tends toward that result. They depend upon social conditions—education, wealth, tastes, manners, or even whims;

but there is a point beyond which neither our politics nor our religion should allow them to go. It should be considered an offense against our self-respect and the public conscience to allow them to go further against the colored man than against the Hindu, the Japanese, or any other distinctly marked race, for the American colored man has higher claims upon us than any of these races. The Hindu or Japanese is physically as distinctly, if not more distinctly, marked by nature than the American African—if not by color, yet by other traits. As the latter rises in his circumstances he rises with peculiar rapidity in his tastes, dress, and manners. He is the natural Frenchman of the New World in the etiquette of manners and apparel. We admit the well-dressed, well-mannered Japanese, Hindu, or Sandwich Islander to our hotels, railroads, or omnibuses, and even to dinner tables; why, in the name of all good sense or good taste, should we hesitate to extend equal courtesy to the equally presentable American colored man? Especially in the South should we expect to see these illogical prejudices extinguished, for why should the Southerner, whose infant sports were with colored children, who was carried in the arms of a colored nurse, and even nourished at her breast, why should he disdain to travel in the same railroad car, or lodge in the same hotel, with his old colored playmate, now his fellow-citizen, and as well dressed and as well behaved as his other fellow-citizens? Clearly enough these antipathies are but whimsical prejudices, and should, especially in our new circumstances, be thrown to the winds.

We are more urgent for this social self-emancipation now that the Supreme Court at Washington has decided against the constitutionality of the Civil Rights Act of 1875. The decision still leaves the Act in full force in the Territories and the national capital; and this is much, and will tend to fashion public opinion; but in the individual States the African citizen is left without legal protection against disparaging treatment in hotels, theaters, public conveyances, etc. The individual States themselves should now provide that protection; still better, public opinion should provide it. Public opinion should demand no special favors for him, but it surely should demand for him perfect impartiality; it should claim for him equal treatment with the Japanese, Chinese, Hindu, or any other

marked race of equal personal conditions. We believe that, soon or later, it will do so.

Thirdly, the religion of the land should especially get rid of its prejudices against this much-wronged people. The "color line" should be obliterated throughout the American Church. But let us not be misunderstood here. As we have already affirmed, no mere legislative act of Church or State can obliterate such invidious lines; but public sentiment can. Public sentiment must indeed itself be first rectified. But we believe public opinion is capable, in these Christian States, of any beneficent advancement. It broke the chains of the Negro slave; it changed the national Constitution to make him a citizen equal to the best of us; it rallied hosts of our best men and women to go, with the ardor of missionaries, to the South to educate him and his children; and it has inspired some of our capitalists to found, by the donations of millions, grand, permanent provisions for the education of his race. Let us have confidence in American public sentiment; there is nothing to-day, in the whole Christian world, more generous or more powerful, in spite of its many errors or whimsicalities. It needs but to be specifically and resolutely directed by right leaders to obliterate the "color line" from our Churches. But, it will doubtless be asked, Would you flood our white congregations with untutored, uncleansed, unmannered blacks? Not at all. We would have the illogical, fastidious, unchristian, discrimination of the Negro from all other races, in this respect, abandoned as unworthy of our religion, our politics, our humanity, and we would have it peremptorily assumed and asserted that there is no such danger as is apprehended or pretended from such an emancipation of the Church—its own emancipation, let us say it, rather than that of the African —from an inhuman, an inherently anti-Christian, prejudice. Things are a law unto themselves in all such cases. The Negro does not wish to intrude into your churches; he prefers his own, and does it too strongly for his own good or for our good. We can safely treat him, in this respect, as we treat all other men whether Celt, Japanese, Chinese, or our poor white Anglo-Saxon brother. Let us have no invidious sentinel at the church door or the pew door against him, none more than against any other race or class under our national flag.

The poor white man goes, with his humbly-dressed family, to the sanctuaries of his own class; he prefers to go there, and no fastidious church in the land fears his undue intrusion into its garnished aisles; there is no "line" of discrimination against him there, except the undefined, the tacit one, which social convenience or his own good sense and good taste may suggest. Why not give the colored citizen equal right, especially in the temples of our common God? If, like his poor white, or Japanese, or Chinese brother, he should rise, in individual cases, in culture and social condition—in manners, dress, intelligence, etc.—to a rank essentially equal with your own, and should then seek for his family a well-paid pew in your sanctuary, why forbid him? In every land under heaven, except this Christian republic, he has not only the right to do so, but is welcomed as a "man and a brother." In St. Paul's, in Westminster Abbey, of London, in Notre Dame, of Paris, in St. Peter's, of Rome, no prince nor coxcomb would decline to sit beside him. We alone, in all the Christian world, have the ungracious, we were about to say the ridiculous, fastidiousness to order him away from us, or take ourselves away from him. There is no church of the land in which a well-dressed and a well-mannered Japanese or Hindu would not be admitted, and be even an object of generous interest however conspicuous his seat there. Why, then, repel an African fellow-citizen of equal social condition? We repeat that the prejudice, which has ordained among us the "color line," is an egregious social fallacy, against which every really high-minded citizen should protest as belittling to our national good sense, our religion, and our republicanism. We believe, further, that nearly all our apprehensions of social inconveniences from the obliteration of that "line," especially in the Church, are utterly fallacious. We believe that in "Old Trinity," in "Grace Church," or any other notable church of New York, the habitual appearance of a well to-do, cultivated African family in their own pew would soon come to be considered an honor to the congregation. It would be a noteworthy example of Catholic Christianity as acknowledged in all the high places of Christendom beyond our own land. It would be a triumph over prejudice to which the Christian heart of the community would, soon or later, respond with admiration. It would be such a recognition of

our common humanity as could not fail itself to be recognized with honor by all thoughtful men.

One topic more we might allude to here as of immeasurable importance, in respect to the African-American, namely, his education; but we have reached the proposed limit of this article, and what need of enlarging on a subject of such obvious significance, one upon which there has been so much public interest, to which so many heroic men and women are devoting their lives, and to which individual philanthropists have consecrated millions!

Let us say, in conclusion, that notwithstanding the grave difficulties of the problem we have been considering, and the merely hypothetical solutions of it we have suggested, yet the treatment of the colored man, which we have urged, seems to us to be about the sum of our responsibility for, and practicable management of, the question. Let us do this our duty, and leave the rest to that beneficent Providence which has hitherto guided our national destiny. Great things are undeniably before us all, whites and blacks, in the providential programme of this grand New World; humanity is here probably to take on new developments such as have never been dreamed of in our political and social speculations. It may not be for us to forecast these coming destinies by our theories, but we can forecast them by our practice. Let us emancipate ourselves from prejudices; let us rise above traditional fallacies; let us seek to embody in our legislation, and in all our social conventionalism, the universal principles of humanity, religion, and liberty, and the God of our fathers will take care of our country and our children.

Art. VII.—PROBATION AFTER DEATH.

[First Article.]

Probation is the moral trial of intelligent and free beings, under divinely-appointed conditions, in preparation for reward or punishment in the world to come. As used by Bishop Butler, who first brought the term into prominence, it means "that our future interest is now depending, and depending upon ourselves; that we have scope and opportunities here for that good

and bad behavior which God will reward and punish hereafter; together with temptations to one, as well as inducements of reason to the other." * Over against our natural depravity, which of itself would necessitate a failure, is placed the ever-availing grace of the atonement, whereby success is possible to every man. The central point of the test is not, however, an unfailing, perfect obedience to law, as with Adam before the Fall, but a new one, adapted to fallen beings, of the acceptance or rejection of the gracious remedy in the cross of Christ, through which alone can the power of sin be escaped and holiness won. The providential advantages of individuals greatly vary with different ages and other circumstances, and it may be safely assumed that the Judge of all the earth, who surely will do right, knows well how to measure responsibility in every case. But if any be destitute of intelligence, or if any, because of some necessitating agency outside of himself, be not free to choose his course, he stands as a non-probationer, for whom any proper trial is not conceivable.

The general faith of the Christian Church is that human probation closes with the present earthly life, and that in the final judgment at the end of the world every person will receive his eternal and unalterable award according to his character, the righteous being crowned with everlasting blessedness, and the wicked consigned to everlasting conscious punishment. From this common faith there are three classes of dissent, holding,

1. The ultimate recovery to holiness of all wicked men and fallen angels, and the cessation of evil throughout the universe, involving the continuance of probation until it is accomplished.

2. The continuance of probation to the impenitent during the period between death and the judgment-day, at which time the final award will be made.

3. A second probation after death for those who in this life have had no knowledge of Christ and his Gospel, such as the heathen and children dying in infancy.

In the examination of the question of probation after death, while our ultimate appeal must be to Holy Scripture, and especially to the words of Christ himself, the query arises whether our Lord in any way contradicted the opinions on the subject of the eternal punishment of the wicked prevalent in his day,

* "Analogy," part i, chap. iv, 1.

and also whether the doctrine held by his early followers was in accord with that which he taught. For it would be a very important, but difficult, task for the denier of endless punishment to explain why, if the Jews were wrong, he did not correct them, and also, if the early Christians had fallen into error, how it came to pass, and how it became so unanimous and unquestioned. Let us, then, notice first:

I. The sentiment held at and about the time of Christ.

1. Among Jewish writers.

The Book of Judith, (xvi, 17,) written about a hundred years before Christ: "Woe to the nations that rise up against my kindred. The Lord Almighty will take vengeance of them in the day of judgment, putting fire and worms in their flesh; and they shall feel them and weep forever."

The Book of Enoch, (ciii, 4, 5:) "Woe to you, sinners, when ye die in your sins, and they who are like you say of you, Blessed are these sinners. . . . Has it not been shown to them that, when to the receptacle their souls shall be made to descend, their evil deeds shall become their greatest torment? Into darkness, into the snare, and into the flame which shall burn to the great judgment, shall their spirits enter, and the great judgment shall be for every generation, even forever."

The Fourth Book of Esdras, (vii, 36:) "A lake of torment shall appear, and over against it a place of rest: and the oven of gehenna shall be shown, and over against it a paradise of delight. . . . If one be of those who have despised and not kept the way of the Most High, or who despised his law and who hated those who fear him, their souls shall not enter the habitations, [garners;] but shall wander about thenceforth in torments, ever grieving and sad."

The Apocalypse of Baruch, (lxxxv, 98:) "Prepare ye your souls, that, when ye have ended your voyage and disembarked, ye may rest, and not be condemned, for the Most High will bring all these things. There will be no more place of repentance, nor bound to times, nor length to hours, nor change of way, nor place for petition, nor sending of entreaties, nor obtaining knowledge, nor giving of charity, nor entreaties of parents, nor orison of prophets, nor help of the righteous, but there will be sentence to the destruction of the way of fire, and the path which leadeth to the hot coals."

Josephus, ("Ant.," xviii. 1, 3:) "The Pharisees believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that beneath the earth there will be rewards or punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life; and the latter are to be detained in an everlasting prison, *εἱργμὸν ἀϊδιον*; but that the former shall have power, the other have permission, to revive and live again," and that the souls "of the wicked are to be *ἀϊδίῳ τιμωρίᾳ κολάζεσθαι*, punished with eternal vengeance." *

Dr. Farrar objects to Josephus generally as an untrustworthy witness,† and to these passages in particular, because "his words are unscriptural." ‡ Yet the latter citation contains the very words which he complains were not used by our Saviour if he intended to teach endless punishment, admitting at the same time that "Josephus and some Christian writers, when they want to speak of endless retribution, do use such words." § The real reason may be that *ἀϊδίος* would better express to strangers, unfamiliar with the Hebrew mode of thought, the idea intended by *αἰώνιος*.

Dr. Pusey, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, is authority for the statement that the expression of belief was uniform and unmistakable, with the one exception of the Sadducees, who did not believe in a future life, "but whoever did believe in it, believed in the eternity of the weal and woe which God would allot to the righteous or the wicked." The theory that punishment in gehenna is limited, he shows, originated with Rabbi Akiba, eighty-six years after our Lord's ascension, and had reference, not to all mankind, but to the Jew alone. ‖

2. Among early Christian Fathers.

Ignatius of Antioch, A.D. 107: "One so defiled [by corrupting the faith of God] will go into the unquenchable fire, and in like way he who heareth him."

Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, A.D. 155, when threatened with the stake, replied, "You threaten me with fire that burns for one hour and then cools, not knowing the judgment to come nor the perpetual torment of eternal fire to the ungodly."

* "Bell. Jud.," ii 8, 14.
† "Mercy and Judgment," p. 193.
‡ "Mercy and Judgment," p. 196.
§ *Ibid.*, p. 385. See p. 131.
‖ "What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?" p. 78, 87.

Justin Martyr, A.D. 141, in his Defense of the Christians to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, said: "Briefly, what we look for, and have learned from Christ, and what we teach, is as follows: Plato said to the same effect, that Rhadamanthus and Minos would punish the wicked when they came to them. We say the same thing will take place, but that the judge will be Christ, and that their souls will be united to the same bodies, and will undergo an eternal punishment, and not as he (Plato) said, for a period of a thousand years only."

Irenæus, pupil of Polycarp, and Bishop of Lyons, A. D. 180, writing against the Gnostic heresies, says: "The Church, though scattered through the whole world to the ends of the earth, has received from the apostles and their disciples the faith . . . in one Christ Jesus . . . and his appearing from heaven in the glory of the Father . . . to raise up all flesh of all mankind that . . . he may execute righteous judgment over all, sending into eternal fire the spiritual powers of wickedness and the angels who transgressed and apostatized, and the godless and unrighteous and lawless and blasphemous among men." He adds, "The Church, having received this preaching and this faith . . . zealously preserves it as one household, . . . and unanimously preaches and teaches the same." In a Latin form, he says, "the Saviour of those who are saved, and the Judge of those who are judged, and sending, *in ignem æternum*, into eternal fire the perverters of the truth and the despisers of his Father and his advent."

Tertullian (A. D. 200) says Christ "will come again with glory to take the saints into the enjoyment, *vitæ æternæ*, of eternal life and to judge the wicked, *igni perpetuo*, with eternal fire."

Clemens Alexandrinus (A. D. 215) says: "Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance? God forbid. It is clear, then, that those who are not at enmity with the truth, and do not hate the word, will not hate their own salvation, but will escape the punishment of eternity." He elsewhere speaks of the sinner's "securing exemption from eternal death by a little pain." Clemens has been claimed as a Restorationist, but it is probably through wrongly interpreting him as speaking of the purification of sinners by fire, when he meant that imperfect Christians must pass through the fire in order to complete

fitness for heaven, as, indeed, not a few of the fathers believed, even including Augustine, who distinguished between "that eternal fire which shall to eternity torment the ungodly" and "that also which shall amend those who shall be saved by fire, for it is said, 'Yet himself shall be saved, but so as by fire.'"

These citations, purposely not extended later than the time of Origen, who will be mentioned on another page, show a remarkable unanimity of sentiment both in the fathers and in the whole Church.

3. Testimony of the Martyrs.

That unanimity is still more apparent in the sayings of martyrs before their judges, under torture, and in death. They show the faith of all classes—the shepherd and the flock, the teacher and the taught, noble, plebeian, and slave, men and boys, matrons, widows, and girls. With one consent, they see in opposition to fidelity to Christ here only "eternal destruction," "everlasting burning," "eternal punishment," "perpetual torment," and "eternal fire" in the world to come. This universal faith in the people shows the instruction given and received by the Church every-where, which is utterly inexplicable if our Lord and his apostles taught, as is alleged, a contrary doctrine. And if they did, we have a right to look for it in clear, decisive utterances, and not in obscure passages or uncertain inferences which may only mock us at the last. If Christ taught it, it should be found in some distinct statement, with an "I say unto you" as authoritative as any of those in the Sermon on the Mount with which he contradicted the false teaching of his time.

II. Scriptures adduced as teaching probation after death.

We mention only those most strongly relied on. The first is Matt. xii, 31, 32: "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come."

On these words Dr. Farrar says: "Our Lord states with immense plainness, and with no reservation, the possible ultimate remission of every sin and blasphemy *except one*. What that

one is no human being has ever been able to decide." * "It is doubtful whether it is meant that even *this* sin can never be repented of, either here or in the world to come." † Dr. Dorner is more modest: "Whereas other sins find forgiveness without restriction to this life, there is involved a testimony that other sins, aside from the sin against the Holy Ghost, may yet be forgiven in the next world." ‡

The appalling truth in the statement of our Lord is that there is one sin for which there is no forgiveness *even in this life*, and this is made emphatic by the further statement that it cannot be forgiven in the future world. So that, as Professor Wright truly remarks, "Probation may practically close before death." § It is most blessedly true that all other sins are forgivable, but always in accordance with God's conditions of forgiveness, and those conditions, as we know from other Scriptures, are limited to this life. Dr. Farrar's "ultimate" is an adroit gloss of his own without foundation in the passage; and Dorner's "without restriction to this life" assumes that if pardon is limited to this life it must be expressly stated, and so begs the whole question. The parallel passage in Mark iii, 29, reads, "hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation," or, as in the more correct text of the Revision, "guilty, *αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος*, of eternal sin," a sin so bound up with the sinner's existence that from it there is no escape. If possible to be "repented of" by one abandoned by the Holy Spirit, that repentance must be forever unavailing. Dorner admits the necessity of the punishment for those guilty of this sin, but adds, "That does not necessarily exclude deliverance through punishment and its just execution." ‖ It is enough to say here that this would be salvation through perdition, and not through grace, and, besides, would blot out an "eternal sin."

Matt. v, 25, 26: "Agree with thine adversary quickly. . . . Thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing." The case is that of a debtor who can neither pay nor settle with his creditor, almost parallel with the debtor in chap. xviii, 23–34, who owed his lord fifteen

* "Eternal Hope," p. 112.
† "Mercy and Judgment," p. 464.
‡ "Future State," p. 103.
§ "Relation of Death to Probation," p. 29.
‖ "Future State," p. 119.

millions of dollars, and was "delivered to the tormentors till he should pay all that was due." The inference drawn is that punishment for sin is limited in duration. The reply is, (1) The punishment in this case is, indeed, in the sentence pronounced, limited *in its terms*, which therein differs from God's sentence upon the sinner; and yet, inasmuch as the debtor is bankrupt, and can never pay the debt, it is endless *in fact*. For this very reason our Saviour exhorts him to make an arrangement with his creditor before reaching the court, that is, in its spiritual application, he admonishes the neglectful to "quickly" make use of the hour of probation to secure the mercy of God, lest he summarily fall into the hands of inflexible justice. (2) Punishment does not pay the debt of sin. It is not the coin current in the court of heaven with which to purchase salvation. (3) Dorner's remark, that "penal sufferings may be requisite to deliverance," overlooks the absolute condition of payment in full, and forgets that no amount of torturing can enable him to pay who has nothing to pay with.

The passage most depended on to prove probation after death, especially by German theologians, is 1 Pet. iii, 18–20: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." *

As we shall see, opinions on this passage greatly vary. Of those who hold the preaching to have been on the earth, some think it was through Noah to the men of his time; others that it was through the apostles, the disobedient antediluvians being taken as a type of all wicked men. Of those who understand the preaching to have been in hades, some interpret it as announcing terrible condemnation to the ungodly; others, including the Roman and Greek Churches, as triumphantly proclaiming salvation and release to the Old Testament saints; others think that Christ, as conqueror of Satan and the demons, raised the dead to life and declared the true doctrine of the Messiah; and others still, that he published the Gospel of salvation to the spirits of the righteous, and damnation to those

* For a full exposition, see Whedon's "Commentary."

of the wicked. These theories are connected with the doctrine of the Descent into Hell, or, rather, they are accretions to the simple statement of David in Psa. xvi, 10, and St. Peter's citation of it in Acts ii, 27, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, (*hades*,) neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption." Eph. iv, 8–10; Rom. x, 7, and this passage of Peter, have, we think, no reference to that event. But it will be seen that some of the opinions given above are clearly outside the passage in hand, and that none of them involves the offer of salvation to those who died impenitent. Alford gives a list of expositors who admit the descent into hades, but suppose it "to have had another purpose" than preaching the Gospel to the dead, and then very strangely sums up by asserting that "with the great body of commentators, ancient and modern," he holds that Christ did "preach salvation in fact to the disembodied spirits of those who refused to obey the voice of God when the judgment of the Flood was hanging over them." Dr. Newman Smyth falls into the same discrepancy as to "the great consensus of interpreters;" but Dorner, with the same view of the passage, more accurately accepts it "as a result of the more recent exegetical research." * The authority of the great commentators of past ages is thus invoked to sustain a theory which they neither taught nor held, while, on Alford's own testimony, they may be rightfully cited in opposition to the doctrine of future probation.

By many theologians, especially in England and Germany, this passage is held to teach that our Lord preached the Gospel in hades to the disembodied spirits of the disobedient antediluvians of Noah's time who were there confined. This would seem to be sufficiently definite, but the inquirer presently finds the unity of opinion so full of diversity that, like Noah's dove, he has no place for the sole of his foot. It makes a difference whether our Lord's human spirit was in hades simply as other human spirits are, and whether his humiliation continued until he rose from the dead, and whether his preaching there was after his resurrection, and whether his resurrection and glorification began immediately after his death. Nor is it all one whether his acts in hades were in the exercise of his priestly, kingly, or prophetical office. If, indeed, our Lord did truly preach the

* "The Future State," pp. 147, 148.

Gospel there, as Alford, Fronmüller, Wordsworth, Ellicott, Farrar, Dorner, Smyth, Pope, and Townsend assert, these differences should weigh little, if any thing, against the settled fact; they cannot be summarily brushed aside when the question is in debate whether he preached the Gospel there at all. This only increases the hazard of those who would build their faith and rest their souls upon this foundation, so frail at best.

But, granting that our Lord did so preach, we are absolutely limited to the simple fact that he offered salvation to a particular class of antediluvians. Nothing is proved, except that by a well-known law the specification of those to whom he preached excludes all other sinners in hades at the time. There is no evidence that any who heard him accepted his offers. Dr. Newman Smyth admits that "nothing is said or implied concerning the effect of Christ's preaching among the dead." * For aught that appears they scoffed at him as they did of old at Noah. It is absolutely certain that none of them crossed the great, impassable gulf and entered Paradise among the blest. It may be that the obduracy acquired on earth, in spite of Noah's preaching, had become so intense, that repentance was beyond their power or desire. If, then, there be a future probation, this test case furnishes naught but hopelessness. The only lesson is that another chance in the future world would have no different result from the chance in this world. And the fact of no known benefit resulting throws a doubt upon the interpretation given.

Nor, again, is there in this passage the least evidence that the preaching in hades was repeated or continued. Not a few, including Wordsworth, Pope, and Townsend, strongly insist that it was not. On the other hand, the widest latitude is eagerly given to inferences of its repetition and continuance, and these inferences are announced as the proven doctrine of God. Thus, Alford argues from our ignorance that "as we cannot say to what other cases this preaching may have applied, so it would be presumption in us to limit its occurrence or its efficacy." In our view, the presumption is in the opposite direction, for we are not informed that there are any "other cases." Dorner says: "The ceasing of this preaching which Christ began, with his preaching at that time, is neither recorded nor

* "The Orthodox Theology of To-day," p. 184.

reasonably to be supposed,"* thus mistaking the shoulders upon which the burden of proof falls, and forgetting that it is very far from agreed that Christ preached in hades at all.

The most that the passage can be claimed as teaching is that after Christ's death his human spirit went to hades and preached the Gospel to the disobedient antediluvians of Noah's time. But κηρύσσω signifies, *to make proclamation as a herald, to proclaim, to announce, to declare, to tell, to preach.* In the sixty times that the word occurs in the New Testament, what is declared or preached is to be gathered from the context; but it never, in itself, means *to preach the Gospel.* For that the word is εὐαγγελίζω. What, then, did our Lord proclaim? The word translated "preached" does not tell us, the context gives no light, and no mortal knows. The passage, then, does not affirm that Christ preached the Gospel.

Did St. Peter understand these antediluvians in hades to be in a state of probation? The apostle shall answer for himself. In his second epistle, (chap. ii, 4–9,) denouncing a class of sinners of his day for whom he sees only eternal destruction, he makes an argument of which the conclusion reached is this: "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished;" or, as the Revised Version more correctly reads, "to keep [that is, in custody] the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment." His proof of this proposition, for such it really is, consists of three historic precedents in the divine administration, namely, first, in the case of the apostate angels cast down to Tartarus, committed as prisoners to caverns of darkness, and kept in custody unto the final judgment; second, the antediluvians who had for a hundred and twenty years Noah's preaching of repentance and righteousness, and then, when the long-suffering of God became exhausted, were swept from the face of the earth and shut up in the "prison" of hades; and, third, the cities of the plain turned to ashes, overthrown, made an example to the ungodly of all coming time, and (Jude 7) "suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." St. Peter sets forth these three classes as illustrative specimens of those who are kept in prison under guard, enduring punishment, like Dives, and bound over to the judg-

* "Future State," p. 153.

ment-day. The antediluvians are, in his view, equally with the fallen angels and the Sodomites, a standing proof of the assured perdition awaiting the ungodly.

He considers their probation closed forever with death. He could not have cited their case for his purpose had he thought them in a new probation and receiving from Christ the glad tidings of salvation. Nor can we conceive the compassionate Christ as inflicting upon souls beyond remedy the horrid mockery of an offer of mercy which he knew it was impossible for them to accept. And even if he did offer them mercy, it does not follow that he will offer it to us in the next world if we reject him here.

The crucial word in the passage is the participle ζωοποιηθείς, rendered *quickened*. Very singularly, this seems to be generally overlooked in the effort to properly dispose of the two datives, which really derive their force from the participles. The verb means simply *to make alive*. Such is its use in the classics and the Septuagint. It occurs in eleven other places in the New Testament. In seven, John v, 21, twice; Rom. iv, 17; viii, 11; 1 Cor. xv, 22, 36, 45, it refers to the resurrection of the dead; in three, John vi, 63; 2 Cor. iii, 6; Gal. iii, 21, to giving spiritual life; and once, 1 Tim. vi, 13, to God, as the giver of life. In every instance it signifies *to make alive*, that is, *to give life where it has never been, or to restore life where it has once been and has ceased to be.* Its use should be the same here. But when we apply it to Christ's human spirit, which did not die and was already alive, we encounter new definitions specially invented for this particular place. For instance, Steiger and Bloomfield understand a preservation of life; Wordsworth, an increase of life; Alford, the beginning of "a spiritual resurrection life;" Dorner, "a higher state of life, of a pneumatic character;" while Smyth speaks of "the beginning of the new life made after the spirit." Possibly the reader may think this not very intelligible; if so, he is doubtless in goodly fellowship with plain St. Peter himself. All these definitions must be rejected as outside the established meaning of ζωοποιέω, and because, again, none of them is necessary to a correct understanding of the passage. Christ's human spirit did not die; it therefore was not *made alive*, and no change in its sphere or mode of continued being falls

within the meaning of the word. What the case requires is either that something not before existing was *brought into being* and connected with him, or that something belonging to him which had ceased to live was *restored to life.* The former is nowhere intimated; the latter was accomplished in his resurrection from the dead. It clearly follows that πνεῦμα does not mean Christ's human spirit; it must indicate, therefore, either his divine nature or the Holy Spirit. Taking "flesh" in the sense of man's nature, as in John i, 14; Rom. i, 3; 1 Pet. i, 24, and other well-known passages, we have, *put to death indeed as to his human nature, but made alive by his divine nature.* This explains how his sufferings avail to "bring us to God," and exactly parallels the saying of St. Paul, "Was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." Rom. iv, 25.

As to the preaching, it is a little remarkable that St. Peter himself, in speaking elsewhere (2 Pet. ii, 5) of these same antediluvians, mentions Noah as "a preacher (κήρυκα, *a herald*) of righteousness," using the noun from which comes the κηρύσσω here employed, and thus seems to furnish a clew to its manner. Noah was the herald of Christ, the Jehovah of the Old Testament as well as Lord of the New, and under the inspiration of his Spirit he proclaimed for a hundred and twenty years his law to the men around him, who remained unbelieving and disobedient until the Flood came. Thus the preaching was truly Christ's to the antediluvians at the time of their disobedience. (The "sometime," once, aforetime, is from Peter's point of view, not Noah's.) A parallel is Eph. ii, 17, where St. Paul says of Christ who, in his earthly life, did not visit Ephesus: "And came [by his Spirit] and preached [through the apostles] peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh." So Christ "went" by the Holy Spirit "and preached" through Noah to men whom St. Peter identifies as "spirits in prison" at the time of his writing, not in probation, but in confinement awaiting the judgment.

Frequently joined with the passage just considered, as supposed to have the same reference, is 1 Pet. iv, 6: "For this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." The Revised Version reads,

"preached even to the dead." But the connection is not so clear. In the former we have "spirits in prison," and in the latter, the "dead:" in the former, heralding; in the latter, preaching the Gospel, and with no mention of the antediluvians. Why this complete change of expression if the apostle is speaking of the same persons? And, again, what possible encouragement for Christians to brave endurance of persecution even unto death, would there be in the knowledge that our Lord preached the Gospel to antediluvians in hades, which we have shown did not occur? The theory supposed by advocates of probation after death to be here taught is, that the Gospel is preached to all the dead in the other world. But there are several grave difficulties. If "dead" means the dead universally, it includes the sainted dead who need no pardon among those to whom pardon is offered; and this proves too much. Again, *ευηγγελίσθη* is aorist, and shows that the Gospel was preached and *the preaching ceased*, as, indeed, it does to every man at death. Moreover, the plain meaning is that the Gospel was preached to men when living who are now dead, and who will not by death be exempted from judgment for their persecutions.

III. Probation limited to earthly life.

While the Scriptures do not warrant the expectation of a probation after death, they do, on the other hand, most unequivocally and positively connect certain results in the future world with the course pursued and the character attained in the present life, thus excluding the idea of probation beyond it. Our citations shall be chiefly of the words of our Lord himself.

Very explicit is Matt. x, 32, 33: "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven;" or, as we read in Luke xii, 8, "before the angels of God." Like, but more decisive, if possible, is Mark viii, 38: "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." The confession, denial, and shame "before men," and, more definitely, "in this . . . generation," belong to this world, and

are the condition of confession, denial, and shame before God at the second advent, with no hint of a different result from any thing occurring in the long interval. The story of the rich young ruler in Matt. xix, 16–22, who asked the Saviour, "What good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" shows his belief that his condition in the next world would turn upon his conduct here; and our Lord's reply distinctly puts "treasure in heaven" as compensation for the surrender of treasure on earth, thus showing his own understanding on the point. In Rev. ii, 10, the "crown of life" is the promise made to fidelity "unto death;" and for the present purpose it is immaterial whether the words mean during life, or to death by martyrdom. In either case it is the end of earth, and inseparably connected with it is the unfading crown. St. Paul, in 1 Cor. vi, 9, 10, after a general statement, excluding "the unrighteous" from the kingdom, becomes specific, and adds: "Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." This is not a list of lovely characters. Their vices belong, with scarcely an exception, wholly to this world, and when the sons of God enter the kingdom to which they are graciously entitled as heirs, these sinners will be left out. If a sense of justice assent to this because of the greatness of their sins, and it be thought that sins of less magnitude will receive more lenient treatment, let us remember our Lord's words to the Jews, (John viii, 21:) "Ye shall die in your sins: whither I go ye cannot come," and the reason given in verse 24 for the stern statement, namely, "If ye believe not that I am he." Omission and neglect are small things as men measure, but, small as they are, whoever dies in them is shut off from going where Christ is.

Probation sometimes closes suddenly. The lesson related in Luke xii, 42–46, pronounces a blessing on the faithful servant who is ready for his master's coming, but to the careless, selfish, procrastinating, and riotous servant the master's return is unexpected, sudden, and unprepared for; and we are told that his Lord "will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers." Nay, probation sometimes closes before life ends. Such we have found to be the result of his

sin who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit, who, though he may remain years on earth, has already by his voluntary act forever put away from him all hope of mercy, and freely become guilty of "eternal sin." Such was the effect of the sin of the Hebrew apostates, (Heb. vi, 6,) who, in renouncing Christ, declared him to be an impostor and his sacrifice for sin worthless, that, either from their self-induced obduracy or from the withdrawal of the proffers and aid of grace, it was "impossible . . . . to renew them again unto repentance."

The narrative of the rich man and Lazarus, in Luke xvi, 19-31, is full of instruction. If it be thought a parable, we may say that, whatever it be intended to teach, the several features of the picture drawn must have a foundation in the facts of the world of departed spirits, so that our Lord has really given us a glimpse of the condition of souls between death and the judgment. We are not concerned to fix its locality, or, rather, perhaps, its localities, for they seem to be two—Paradise, the abode of the blessed, where the souls of Jesus, the penitent thief, and Lazarus went, and to which St. Paul was "caught up;" and the abode of wretchedness, to which the name of hades peculiarly clings, where the rich man was. They are "afar off" from each other, with a "great gulf fixed" between them, declared by our Lord to be impassable in either direction. Father Abraham preaches no Gospel of salvation; the rich man pleads for no pardon, nor is there token of repentance. The one prayer for himself is that Lazarus may be sent with some alleviation of his anguish, "for," said he, "I am tormented in this flame"—not, of necessity, material flame, but something which is to the soul as material flame is to the body. Even this prayer is denied, and for two reasons: first, he chose and had his portion here, and is now receiving only what he had prepared himself for in his life-time; and, second, it is one of the inflexible laws of that realm of the dead that "they which would pass from hence to you cannot;" so that Lazarus could not fulfill the desired office; and we may add that, for the same reason, the disembodied human spirit of Christ, which went into that world as the natural consequence of death, as do other human spirits, and was subject to its laws, could not cross the impassable gulf to preach the Gospel to the antediluvians there confined.

These references, which might be greatly extended, not only fail to intimate hope for the continuance of probation beyond death, but they so directly connect the future with the present that it should not be thought an open question.

Dr. Dorner argues that "the time of grace does not by a universal law expire with death," from the case of the son of the widow of Nain.* Luke vii, 11–15. Dr. Smyth, referring to the same case, takes up the strain, speaking of "prolongation upon earth of probation after death had ensued, which could not be if at death the final judgment takes place;" † and, in a foot-note to Dorner, he asks, with a seriousness born apparently of the deepest perplexity, "In the case of Lazarus, after which death, the first or the second, was the judgment appointed for him?" The new reconstructed theology plainly has need of friendly caution, for it cannot stand the strain of many such problems. Surely, Dr. Dorner, "the greatest living theologian," must know that probation is claimed to expire when earthly life ends, and not at some supposed end which is really only an interruption of it. But when Dr. Smyth, the Presbyterian, going beyond his chief, speaks of "the final judgment at death," he does it with full knowledge that the orthodoxy which his "new departure" seeks to modify, holds no such doctrine.

It should be noted that the very passages quoted for half a century to prove Universalism are now employed by advocates of probation after death, from Dr. Smyth to Dr. Farrar, who denies again and again that he is a Universalist, but does his utmost to prove hope for every man, if not after the last judgment, at least in the intermediate state. All good men would rejoice over the repentance of the last sinner and the perfect victory of goodness over evil, and yet not a few who have hoped for it have confessed that the Scriptures do not so teach. Olshausen admits that "no passage of the New Testament affords a clear and positive testimony for the consummation of this longing." Neander sees "only some slight intimation." Thomas Starr King says: "There is no argument for the final triumph of goodness in the four gospels, nor any dogmatic textual assertion of that doctrine." And Theodore Parker, who may be accepted as a competent witness on this point, said in his last discourse: "I think there is not in the Old

* "The Future State," p. 102. † "Orthodox Theology," p. 185.

Testament or the New a single word which tells this blessed truth, that penitence hereafter will do any good." The ground for hope must be sought elsewhere.

But there is some interesting testimony as to the tendencies of this doctrine of probation hereafter. Neander saw them when he said, "We acknowledge the guidance of divine wisdom that, in the records of revelation destined for such varied steps of religious development, no more light has been communicated on this subject." Prof. Herman Messner uses nearly the same highly suggestive words. Origen is more emphatic. In some of his works, the *De Principiis* in particular, written when he was a young man, and not intended for publication, in a philosophical, speculative, and tentative way, he propounds the theory of ultimate universal restoration through a series of transmigrations and probations. On the authority of Jerome it is stated that "in an epistle which he wrote to Fabian, Bishop of Rome, he expressed regret for having written such things, and threw the blame upon Ambrose, who made public what he had written privately." * In his popular writings he taught the common doctrine. In his reply to Celsus he acknowledged that Christ taught eternal punishment, and with the effect of inducing men to strive against those sins which lead to it. He, however, calls the fear of it a beneficial deception brought about by God himself, yet thought its rejection dangerous. "For," said he, "many wise men, or such as thought themselves wise, after having apprehended the real truth respecting the divine punishments and rejected the delusion, have given themselves up to a vicious life. It would have been much better for them to have continued in the delusion, and to believe in the eternity of the punishments of hell." † The dangerous tendency has in no wise diminished with the passage of the centuries.

IV. The decisions of the day of judgment based upon the deeds of this life.

Dr. Farrar arraigns as a "popular accretion" to the teaching of Scripture the notion that, "at death, there is passed upon every impenitent sinner an irreversible doom to endless torments." ‡ None should know better than that eminent scholar

* "What is of Faith?" pp. 129–200.

† Hagenbach, § 78. ‡ "Eternal Hope," preface, p. xiv.

and brilliant preacher that the common view places the passage of that doom at the day of judgment, and not at death. We must not confound God's act of judicial sentence with his daily discrimination of human character, nor yet with man's act in deciding his own condition and destiny. There is, undoubtedly, in God's mind an opinion, a discrimination, a judgment, a classifying of men in this life, so that, as Fletcher expresses it, we are every moment pleasing or displeasing to him according to the whole of our inward tempers and our outward behavior. Our present acceptance or condemnation turns upon our voluntary position with respect to him and his truth. "He that believeth not is condemned already," not by a judicial act of God, but by the terms of the law of grace. He may change this state if he chooses to believe; if he chooses not, it abides with him when he passes away from life and can choose no longer. Thenceforward, with conscious knowledge of himself, even as God will know him, and with full certainty of the issue, he will await the public trial of the last day, when definite sentence will be passed upon every man according to the self-determined course of the present life.

The Scriptures are very plain upon the point. St. Paul gives as the reason for his incessant striving for present acceptance with his Lord the fact, that "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. v, 10. He evidently does not anticipate a chance in the intermediate state of recovery from failure through negligence here. In Rom. ii, 5, 6, he teaches that at "the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, [he] will render to every man according to his deeds," and the specifications following describe conduct belonging to this life. In that day (verse 16) "God shall judge the secrets of men," the things covered up and hidden, which earth has in plenty, but are hardly supposable in the transparency of the world of spirits. The same apostle, in Heb. ix, 27, connects death with the judgment in these words: "It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment," with no intimation of a day of grace in the interval. The connection of the two events is placed beyond criticism by the parallel in verse 28 of Christ's death for sin and his second advent

to gather its fruits in the eternal salvation of those expecting his coming. In Heb. x, 26, 27, for them that "sin willfully," as apostates do, and as saints in Paradise cannot, "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation" as their only possible fate.

St. Peter, in a passage (chap. ii, 9,) already discussed, shows that the unrighteous of this world are strictly guarded in prison under punishment unto the day of judgment, when (verse 3) eternal destruction will surely be inflicted. And St. John, in Rev. xxi, 7, 8, while assuring the victorious struggler of a blessed heirship, says of the opposite class, "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." Some of the sins pointed out can be committed only on the earth, and they who commit them are, with the moral coward and the simple neglecter of Christ, to be "judged every man according to their works." Rev. xx, 13.

And what says our Lord? Referring to the judgment-day, (Matt. vii, 22, 23,) he affirms that many in that day will claim to have prophesied, expelled demons, and performed miracles in his name, all of which are deeds in time, "and then," he says, "will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." In Matt. xi, 20–24, he declares that "it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment than for" Chorazin and Bethsaida, and "for the land of Sodom" than for Capernaum; and in chap. x, 15, "for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah than for that city" which rejects his disciples and their message. No place is left for the hypothesis of the repentance of these people in hades, and in the judgment they will stand relatively as they did then. In Mark viii, 38, he that is "ashamed" of Christ and his teachings "in this adulterous and sinful generation," which is very definite as to time, will have Christ "ashamed" of him at his second coming. And in the solemn delineation of the proceedings of the judgment-day in Matt. xxv, 31–45, the reasons assigned for the decisive awards pronounced relate without exception to deeds of this world, performed by those on the right hand of the Judge, and not performed by those on his left.

Such are some of the sayings of our Lord and his apostles

that connect conduct in this life with the final judgment. They make no reservation. They give no hint of some possible change of character in the intermediate state that may reverse the result in the day of trial; but, on the other hand, they distinctly teach that the stamp which character bears at death is ineffaceable. The fixed permanency thenceforth is in the nature of things, and is always in accordance with the choice freely made under the light and influences of a probationary state and in full view of its obligations. Surely it becomes those who advocate the doctrine of future probation to explain the entire absence in these stern and positive declarations of the New Testament of a mitigating word, or even of the least intimation of some chance for repentance after death. And still more is it incumbent on them to explain why Christ, who seized so many opportunities to contradict and correct erroneous sentiments of his time, not only did not contradict the prevalent view on this subject, but always spoke in accordance with it. The truth is nigh at hand. He did not correct it because it was true. He came to a race of sinners to offer himself to them as God's provided remedy for sin and the giver of life to their souls, and demanding acceptance. Not to believe on him when offered is to reject him, and upon such rejecters "the wrath of God abideth." Probation, then, summarily closed would not be injustice, and its further continuance is purely of the compassion and long-suffering that will not willingly let a soul perish. Through lengthened years he seeks them with the Gospel, with his Spirit, with providences, with multiplied warnings and entreaties, until he is weary of rejection, and death closes the scene with pity for the infatuation that spurns the beseechings of infinite love.

Neither the blessedness of the Christian nor the wretchedness of the sinner will be perfected until the resurrection; but it does not follow that the intermediate world is one of moral change except by growth. In Dr. Dorner's view, "believers are not yet sinless at the moment of death;" * and as "only the pure in heart, or holy, shall see God," † they must become freed from moral imperfection in the future world before they can enjoy the glorious vision. Dr. Smyth, faithful in his following, cannot see "how the mere accident of death can fit an

* "Future State," p. 100. † *Ibid.*, p. 93.

untrained and unchastened Christian for the pure vision of the supernal glory."* No more can Dr. Farrar, or Dr. Pusey, or the Romish Church, who argue that infirmities, moral defects, evil habits, sins, and neglects will, by training, by discipline, by punishment, by purifying fire, become finally purged away, and the soul prepared for the blessed vision of God. All alike assume that the moral processes of this life shall be in the next world much as they are in this, only, perhaps, "much more abundant." Holy we must be before we can see God; but neither death's cold stream nor purgatorial burning has power to make us so. The believer has learned a better way. The infirmities and defects, physical and mental, inherent in our nature must, indeed, be carried to the end, but the "blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin" in this life. It may be true that many devout Christians do not attain this gift of grace until near death; but it is likewise true that no child of God passes that boundary without a previous full preparation by the Holy Spirit dwelling in him to meet his Redeemer and Judge. All hopes of becoming fit for heaven after death must prove fallacious. Spotless holiness must be won before that hour; but the blessedness of the saved, far exceeding aught on earth, will increase until its consummation at the resurrection. This, however, involves no change of destiny.

In our examination of the teachings of Scripture we have not forgotten the multiplied admonitions against the "ignorant tyranny of isolated texts," to use the words of Dr. Farrar, or the necessity of inquiry for the broad outlines, the unity, and the drift of revealed truth. There is no divinely prepared table of contents outlining for us beforehand the Book of God, and no one has informed us how to discover those outlines, to find that unity, or to learn that drift, except in the careful study of its words. Beginning thus, and moving forward step by step, we find the Scriptures, from "God" in the first verse to "the grace of the Lord Jesus" in the last, to be an urgent message of salvation sent by Infinite Love to a sinful, guilty, ruined race. In its letter and in its spirit, in its single words and its broad outlines, in its separate expressions and its whole drift, it demands acceptance to-day, and makes no provision or suggestion for to-morrow. Our Lord's preaching, both in the

* "Orthodox Theology," p. 126.

plainest of words and in the most significant of parables, and the preaching and writings of his apostles as well, always treat the subject as if this life were the only time in which men can prepare for the next. They warn, they exhort, they plead, they urge to immediate action while the power of acting remains, as if the final issue were to turn upon the next step; and they never intimate even a suspicion of an opportunity in the future world to recover from the present neglect, while they do most strongly base condition there upon character here. These facts are strangely mysterious and absolutely unaccountable, if human probation extends into the future life; they are perfectly plain, and precisely what we might expect in a revelation of a way of salvation, if the day of grace is limited to the present world.

ART. VIII.—DR. ELIPHALET CLARK.

ELIPHALET CLARK, M.D., was born in the town of Strong, Maine, May 12, 1801. His father, Mr. Richard Clark, of Puritan descent, was among the pioneer settlers of the Sandy River Valley, one of the most beautiful of the many picturesque sections of the State. Mr. Clark was a farmer, and on his farm reared, amid the rigors of a New England climate, a large family.

Our early pioneer ministry at a very early day penetrated the settlements of Sandy River, and gathered among its sturdy settlers some of their richest harvests. Very near the Clarks lived the Soules. Both families became Methodists; the one gave Joshua Soule to the ministry, and the other Eliphalet Clark to the laity, of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Young Clark was converted in his father's house at family worship when he was eighteen years of age. The change was thorough, and accompanied by a clear witness of his acceptance with God. This sound conversion not only gave bent to all his subsequent actions, but was the key which ever unlocked to him the secret wards of the divine kingdom.

In one of his first letters to his parents, 1826, soon after leaving home, Eliphalet thus showed his appreciation of their influence: "But for no particular of your concern in my welfare do I feel more grateful than for the religious restraints imposed when my mind was easily impressed, and for the religious instructions by which I was frequently caused to reflect, when a child, on the uncertainty of life, and the necessity of a change of heart to be prepared for another and more important state of existence."

Of his brother Dennis, whom he called his "twin spirit," and who died, while a young man, in New Orleans, he wrote: "Is Dennis indeed *dead?*

True, his dead body, his earthly part, his well-wrought frame, may now be decaying in a far-distant city among strangers; no one to visit the grave and say, Here lies my son, my brother, and drop a tear of affection, and plant a rose on the sacred spot; yet, is *Dennis* dead? A voice from Him who is the resurrection and the life, declares *he shall never die.* All that made Dennis so lovely, all that so closely bound our hearts in one, lives in heaven."

Eliphalet, after receiving an academical education at Farmington, Me., read medicine with Dr. J. L. Blake, of Phillips, and also with Dr. Thomas Little, one of the most eminent surgeons of the State. Between the pupil and the venerated teacher, Dr. Blake, who still survives, there ever subsisted the warmest affection. In 1824 he received the degree of Doctor of Medicine from the medical school of Bowdoin College.

His first settlement as a physician was in the town of Wilton. While here he was married, October 8, 1827, to Miss Nancy Caldwell, only daughter of Mr. William Caldwell, of Hebron, Me., and the sister of the Rev. Zenas Caldwell, of the Maine Conference, and of Professor M. Caldwell, afterward of Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. Miss Caldwell was reared by her eminently godly mother under a *régime* which accepted the theory that it is safer for young Christians always to lean toward the "stricter virtues." She became the life-long companion of her husband. She fully appreciated his genius and character, and, in a very important sense, merged her life in his. Her rare tact, affability, and patience, but, above all, her deep, intelligent, and steady piety, made her to him all that a man called of God to a laborious and useful service could require. From first to last no one more certainly perceived or more readily acknowledged her worth than her husband. As early as 1832 he expressed it to his parents: "My good Nancy is a host herself, none better, and, may be, none so good. 'Ah,' say you, 'Eliphalet can brag at any time.' Well, laugh at my folly; still, let me say, no man's wife is better than mine, none a better nurse, more sympathetic and devoted, the very angel of kindness. Well, laugh, or say umph. I know what I say."

The account of the marriage, written to a brother, may be a little amusing, but would there were more such wedding days! "Tuesday morning talked and sang and prayed all day. In the evening we were married for the first time in our lives; felt anxious about the sequel, of course. We were married in three or four minutes; then had a prayer-meeting, very interesting. . . . Friday reached home; set up a few things, talked some, and dedicated our home, our goods, our souls and bodies, our ALL, to God; were some happy."

Soon after locating at Wilton he had a severe sickness, from the ill effects of which he never fully recovered. During convalescence he wrote: "O may I, with increasing strength, be increasingly happy, holy, and useful! . . . You may know the service of God is still my delight."

In 1830 Dr. Clark removed to the city of Portland. He had but little money and no influential friends to introduce him. The following account, in a letter at the time to Professor Caldwell, speaks for itself:

"See one or two sick folks every *week*. Expenses about one dollar a day; income, twenty-five cents. That's making money. However, I expect every day to obtain great celebrity, and, of course, much business, and then I shall be rich. Don't you wish your prospects were as good as mine?"

Again, in 1831, in the same vein: "Hi-ho-hum! Most tired boarding out. O dear! Nancy some home-sick. Not much business, no money. O what can the matter be! Tam-to-diddle, diddle, diddle-de! Wish you could just look through my windows and see the blue houses and the blue horses and the blue sky. 'Home, home, sweet home, there's no place like home,' etc., (singing.) Any body comes here to get rich must learn to live on nothing, and make money out of the north angle of two ideas. Hurrah! (smiting his fists and scratching his head) hurrah! I never lay down in the ditch yet, and I'll give it one pull before I let it go. Hurrah for Jackson! He's mad with Calhoun, and I may get an office by this means. If South Carolina repudiates much more I shall be off in a giff, as Jack Downing would say."

It is not surprising such courage was rewarded. He almost immediately built up a large and lucrative practice both as physician and surgeon. He did this without compromising his religion or his Methodism. He became an active official member of the Chestnut-street Methodist Church. At that day the Methodists were rather looked down upon in the cultured communities of New England, and more than once it was broadly hinted to the struggling young doctor that, if he would succeed, he must leave them and join some more popular sect. His reply was substantially, "Success or no success, I am a Methodist; and I cannot give up principle for profit or fame." And stick to his Church he did, with the best results both for himself and the Church. He lived to be more respected for his adherence to his denomination, and the respect which he gained as a man aided not a little the cause of which he was an acknowledged representative.

Dr. Clark, while catholic in his views and feelings, counting always among his esteemed friends many members of the various Christian communions, was a Methodist from *conviction*. Yet he became quite early a reader outside of his professional studies. Ere he had attained his prime he was fully imbued with the distinctive Wesleyan doctrines, and always held them with the utmost firmness. His persuasion of the supreme importance of these doctrines made him feel that his Church had a right to be and to grow. His judgment was, that it was especially needed in New England to answer a want of many minds which could accept neither the ultra-orthodoxy of Calvinism, nor the latitudinarianism of so-called liberal Christianity. And yet his mind, like his home, was most hospitable. Enthusiastic in his love of truth, of a speculative turn, he was ready to learn from every source, and any religious opinion which presented itself with good credentials would be respectfully entertertained for the time and duly considered.

Not many years after his location in Portland his attention was called

to the works of Swedenborg. The dreamer drew strongly upon his vivid imagination, with that peculiar spell by which he has charmed many minds both in Europe and America; but there were some stubborn facts which stood in the way. What, no justification by faith! No vicarious atonement! Now he knew that God for Christ's sake had forgiven his sins. This was enough. Only a day or two before his death, he said: "When I was a young man Swedenborgianism was presented to me, and it had some attractions; but it required me to give up the doctrine of justification by faith, and this I never could do. Then the doctrine of the Godhead—Father—Logos—Paraclete—three, THREE, not one person, became fixed in my mind. This is the wonderful system so adapted to man's need."

Thus a sound religious experience saved him from what he regarded afterward as a very specious and dangerous error. As with this, so with the doubts and denials which more or less prevailed in the highly speculative New England religious atmosphere. "To me," he said again, "the answer to salvation is my own consciousness. You know I have always been fond of theology and speculation, and have indulged my taste. So it was a wonderful mercy that the Holy Spirit came to me, sweeping away all doubt, and forever settling my mind. Now, these," alluding to the nearness of death, "are no times for doubt and uncertainty; salvation is a great practical question."

Thus with him was attested the principle that *faith*, in its evangelical sense, is the foundation of religion. He realized this faith given of God, distinguished alike from historical belief, and the conclusions of reason, and possessing internal certainty, to be indeed the verifying faculty of the soul. It revealed Christ to him as a personal Redeemer, and consequently the Son of God, who liveth and abideth forever.

An additional and very urgent reason for the existence of Wesleyanism with Dr. Clark was the prominence it gave to the definite experience of Christian perfection. He espoused the doctrine when quite a young man, and held it fast with maturer and ripened faculties. In his later years he was seldom heard to refer to it, much less to his own personal attainments; but it was well understood by those who knew him best what his opinion was, and where, if occasion required an expression, he was accustomed to stand.

As early as 1839 he wrote: "My own enjoyment in communing with God has been increased. . . . I have some hope that I feel the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin. . . . Here I rest, relying only on Christ for all I need. How peace comes to my heart and love to all men! . . . The class which I have led for some years is generally prosperous. Four of my members and two others who have attended pretty regularly have professed the blessing of perfect love. Their lives show what their lips profess. The work of holiness has been gradual in most of these cases. A strong conviction of impurity, of want of full conformity to the holy law of God, a hungering and thirsting for righteousness, has characterized them all. The blessing has been accompanied with the witness

of the Spirit in each case. In some several days have elapsed before the witness came, but when it was given it was clear as light, hushing every murmur of the soul, and giving peace that passeth understanding."

As might be expected Dr. Clark was in intelligent and hearty sympathy with the Church, not only in its doctrines, but in its polity and work. While his health admitted he had the charge of a large and prosperous class, and was a regular attendant upon the public and the social devotional services. He co-operated with his pastors in their efforts to promote revivals of religion, and to build up both the spiritual and material welfare of the congregation. At one time, being greatly exercised for a revival in the Chestnut-street charge, he prayed most earnestly for it. He thought he would exact large things, and ventured to ask God for the conversion of one hundred persons. The revival came, and one hundred persons were converted. He thanked God, but felt a little sorry he did not ask for a larger number. The pastors of the earlier days, and before his enforced retirement from the means of grace, will recall what a power he was in the spiritual life of the people.

In private, however, he was always accessible to the brethren, and especially to his pastors. "How are you?" "How was your meeting?" was the quick inquiry as the pastor entered his door. If all was well and prosperous, he rejoiced; if adverse, he was ready with a strong and cheery word. What the Rev. W. R. Clark, of Boston, once his pastor, writes, all his pastors will indorse:

"Dr. Clark possessed a kingly nature, all his ideals of life were of the royal type, and his lightest word was freighted with wisdom. Although compelled by delicate health, at or before the time when I was his pastor, to keep aloof from active participation in the religious work of the Church, yet the pronounced thoughts and feelings of his great heart were a perpetual benediction—a fountain clear and exhaustless. He was the soul of courtesy toward his pastors, generous, appreciative, deferential, and steady as the sun in the warmth of his friendship. Devout, practical, and progressive, he was a tower of strength. Eminent in his profession, and of commanding influence, he was such a support to his pastors as it rarely falls to their lot to find."

Dr. Clark was a "born leader." All with whom he was associated recognized his capacity for guidance and control. Although he never sought prominence, yet he was never afraid of responsibility. It is not too much to say that our Church owes largely what it is to-day in the city of Portland and vicinity to his foresight, enterprise, and liberality. He was the principal man in the erection of the present edifice of the Chestnut-street Church. In feeble health at the time, (1856,) both he and his wife were ready to acknowledge that his life was spared for this work. It was, when finished, an ornament to the denomination in the city. Bishop Morris, after inspecting it, pronounced it "the best house for all purposes in Methodism." To show his interest, he not only conferred constantly with the architect and builder, watching each stone and timber, but he studied carefully the construction of pipe organs, in order that no

mistake might be made, and they should have the best instrument possible for the money. This was not all; he either gave or secured the land on which the Pine-street and Congress-street churches were built; and among his last works was to see completed a tasteful house of worship at Woodford's, the village where he spent the closing years of his life. Dr. Clark's zeal for education in the Methodist Episcopal Church was, if possible, even greater than for church building. His conviction was that the Church which educates the people will be the Church of the people.

In harmony with these views he became the early and constant friend of Kent's Hill Seminary. As far back as 1831 he wrote to Professor Caldwell: "When every denomination, nearly, in the State has its seminary of learning, and all are urging forward their claims on public patronage, is this the time for us to give up our popular school? No. Let an agent be appointed. . . . Let the agent be a MAN of *one mind* who loves the interests of our youth." When, in 1848, this institution was deeply embarrassed and greatly needed increased accommodations, he suggested the organization of a Board of Education, distinct from the Board of Trustees, to which the care of educational funds could be committed. The Maine Wesleyan Board of Education was incorporated in 1850, and he was elected its first president, which office he held until within a year of his death. He promptly subscribed one thousand dollars to its funds; other subscriptions followed and confidence was restored, and the school entered upon a new career of prosperity.

In 1860 he rejoiced at the completion of the new and commodious building for the female college.

To Mr. James Noyes, the treasurer of the Board of Education, a few days before his death, he said: "This work in which you and I have been engaged these years I am still interested in. You know my views. Be faithful—be faithful." Thus the institution which had his first educational love had his latest care, and to it the bulk of his property was bequeathed. He was one of the first patrons and trustees of the General Biblical Institute of the Methodist Episcopal Church established in Concord, N. H., and afterward removed to Boston.

While Dr. Clark was in full accord with the polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church he was yet progressive in his views. He was an early, consistent, and persistent advocate of lay delegation. He talked and corresponded with most of the leading ministers and laymen of his State, and with many outside of the State, on the subject, and ceased not his efforts until the measure was adopted. His brethren of the Lay Electoral Conference of 1872 offered to elect him the first lay representative to the General Conference which was to meet at Brooklyn, N. Y., but he was obliged to decline on account of poor health. He believed that because Methodism was vital, that, like all true life, it must be 'constant to a constant change,' and when it ceased to be so, there was already proof that decay had set in. Though dying beyond fourscore years, he was never known to utter a word either of disparagement or despondency as to the government of the Church. His soul expanded

and his tongue glowed as he dilated upon its history and prospects. On his death-bed he said: "I joined the Church at eighteen—joined to stay. I have made many mistakes. My life has been full of failures and shortcomings. I love the Church; I have always felt my need of it, and that it helped me. Methodism is a great system; I never liked its doctrines or its polity better. If true to itself, there is no reason why it should not spread over this continent, including Mexico and South America. And within the next fifty years Christianity shall extend over Japan and China, and 'shall reign where'er the sun does his successive journeys run.'"

Dr. Clark had a rare capacity for friendships. A more sincere, loving man never lived. With all the grasp and strength of his intellect, his sensibilities were as tender and refined as any woman's. He loved his kindred and friends until his heart well nigh ached. Like good old Sir Thomas Browne, their sorrows he desired not only to share but to engross. To be filled with their company was his delight. His house was the seat of true hospitality. For very many years it was the home of the Bishops and other ministers, great and small, all brothers beloved in the Gospel. Around his genial hearth sat many a time Hedding, Waugh, Morris, Olin, Janes; and many are the pleasant stories he could tell of these distinguished servants of the Church. Hedding, for example, walking the floor one night discussing preachers and preaching, stretching himself to his full proportions and exclaiming, "Doctor, this preaching is a great business!" Sick preachers from every part of the State came to be treated, and they were both treated and entertained. "He is preaching," said one who knew whereof he spoke, "through more living preachers, whom he has cured or helped, than any other man in the State." Who that has ever been a recipient of his genial hospitality can forget his graceful, dignified, and hearty welcome. "One of the most princely men I ever saw," declared a delegate from the Baltimore Conference in attendance upon the General Conference at Boston in 1852. In his own home he was most himself—as habitual invalidism had debarred him from general society—and here, when those were about him whom he loved, he conversed, did not deliver monologues, but *conversed*, with a familiarity which put every one at ease, and elicited from all the utmost freedom of expression. At such times wise and high talk was so interspersed with playful and sparkling humor, with such delicate compliments for wife, friends, and guests, as to render the occasion ever memorable to those who had the honor and pleasure of his companionship. One of his most beautiful friendships was that with his brother-in-law, Professor Caldwell, of Dickinson. Beginning life together, both highly intellectual and thoroughly devoted to God, the Church, and learning, their correspondence is replete with thought and affection, and would make, if published, a valuable contribution to Methodist and scientific literature.

After all, humanly speaking, Dr. Clark was the *physician*. He had the highest ideal of his profession. "I feel," he remarked years ago to the writer, "that I am as really called of God to be a physician as you are

to be a preacher." His profession was a divine vocation, and consequently he pursued it with devout, scrupulous, and unflagging fidelity. As long as he was physically able to prescribe for and visit the sick, he could not retire from active practice. Having no other law of life than loyalty to the truth, he was in medicine a thorough and impartial inquirer. Quite early in his career peculiar circumstances called his attention to Homœopathy. After a full, practical, and conscientious examination he was convinced of the superiority of that system, and felt bound, even if it diminished his practice, to adopt it. He was one of the first native American physicians who adopted homœopathy, and was associated with the distinguished Dr. Gray, of New York, on the committee which drafted the plan of the American Institute of Homœopathy. In 1863 he was offered the chair of *materia medica* in the New York Homœopathic College, and asked to become Dean of the Faculty. Letters showing the highest estimate of his professional attainments and personal worth were written him urging his acceptance, but he was obliged, on account of feeble health, to decline. Thus, through his whole professional career, notwithstanding his grand physical proportions, sickness curtailed his opportunities. Not unfrequently he would be laid aside for months at a time, and for half his professional life was not able to attend patients at night or in inclement weather. He was restrained, not only in his practice, but in the use of his pen, which he might have wielded greatly to the advantage of the profession and the public.

With all his professional engagements and Church work, Dr. Clark was not fully content. He was also "a man of affairs," in politics, business, temperance, and good neighborhood; he had decided opinions, and in some directions was very active. He was solicited to accept nominations for governor of the State and mayor of the city of Portland, but he uniformly declined, deeming such positions incompatible with his professional duties. He projected and built the horse-railway of the city, and was the first president of the company. He was for a long while a director of the Boston and Portland Steam-Packet Company, and for some years before and at the time of his death its president. He did not believe in retiring from business, or in growing old and falling to the rear, but in standing to the last in the thickest of the fight of life. In matters of business, politics, theology, metaphysics, and literature, there could be discerned no failure in his mental powers. In the summer of 1882 the writer, when visiting him, found he had just finished Bowne's "Metaphysics," and he was as fascinated with it as any school-girl could be with the latest novel. Later on he wrote, touching the Smith-Andover controversy: "They (the Puritans) have already entered upon another transition period, which will land many of them on the ground of Universalism. If a future probation is worth having, to be of any value it must result in the ultimate salvation of all men. Their theology at this time is in a very precarious condition. The foundations are giving way."

The last six years of Dr. Clark's life were spent at Woodford, a rural retreat about two miles from the city. He had owned for some time a

little farm, where he beguiled many an hour, and relieved dull care, and where finally he indulged his taste for the country by building a capacious house, in which he could have plenty of room and sunshine. "Why, doctor," his friends would say, "building such a house, and in the country, at your time of life!" "Yes, it may prolong my life for some years, or none; but at any rate it will remain for some one else to enjoy when I have gone."

On the night of May 12, his eighty-second birthday, he was seized with the illness which, after extreme suffering, terminated his life, June 8, 1883. His death was such as befitted the life he had lived. He died more as a conqueror returns to the triumph. Through all his sickness his mind was clear, and his faith never faltered. Ever and anon, in the intervals of pain, Christian words of wisdom, beauty, and power fell from his lips. They were such as these: "I find now that Christianity is no failure. It is the truth. I am at the gate; the chariot is on the other side to bear me away." "God is my refuge, a very present help. I never had stronger consolation; have the strongest evidence of the truth of Christianity, the truth of the Bible—not a doubt or a fear. It is not matter of the reason, but of the heart, experimental. Yet, as usual with my experience, there is no rapture." "You know I have never been an emotional Christian, but I do feel, if I live long enough, I shall get very happy. O what waves of light have rolled over my soul as I have lain here."

To an old schoolmate and friend he said, "We were boys together. Now I say salvation is no empty word, no mere theory, but a fact—SALVATION! It does not come so much by reason as experience. 'Because I live, ye shall live also.' One such hour as this is worth a life's struggles. I have thought many times of young Tyng, especially his dying testimony: 'Stand up for Jesus!'—testifying for Jesus. Ye are my witnesses. If I had strength I should want to see a great many. My testimony is not to be doubted: saved, saved! So many years and I still cling to the cross." To another friend he said, "And now, to turn to Christ and his salvation; you have known something about it. I have such comfort as I never dreamed of. . . . I have tried to live faithfully, but I see my defects. Rest, such rest! I have not much joy, but it will come afterward. 'Rock of Ages;' sing that often, and think of me. This abiding consciousness, 'I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' He will soon come and take me home." "I shall see you again," remarked the friend. "Yes, in heaven. You will meet me; let there be no failure."

Again, to the family gathered about him: "Such mortal weakness I never felt before. I know I am in God's hands, and he cares for me, and will not allow more suffering than is necessary for me. I am nearer heaven; I feel it." His eyes following his patient, faithful wife, "My dear, don't stay with me, it can do me no good. Joy inexpressible! I am so grateful for the attention I have received from all those dear friends. It is all of the Lord, because we are bound together in Christ's love." To a lady friend who called: "Once I thought my bark was coming into port. The head-lights were in sight, and I expected soon

to hear the bells ring, when I was driven out, to be tossed a little longer on the stormy sea. It will not be long. Give my love to your children." After recovering, during the last day that he survived, from a sinking spell, he remarked, "It is strange how I recovered from the last attack. I seem to have come from home, and to be in a strange place for awhile. I am going home. Glory be to his name! I rejoice in God my Saviour." At night, turning his face and looking up, he said, "You must let me go this time." Early the next morning as the day was dawning the windows were opened, he looked out, but said, "It is growing dark, I am almost home," and soon fell asleep in Christ. These expressions are only a few of the many which he uttered, and which chanced to be taken down. Through all these last days there was the same thoughtfulness for others, the same regard for all human relationships and temporal duties, the same exquisite appreciation of the beauties of nature, and consideration for the welfare of the Church and the State which had characterized him in the fullness of his active powers. Truly, Christianity is its own best witness, and it can never fail so long as it produces such holy and beautiful lives for its confirmation.

ART. IX.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Reviews.

AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN AND ORIENTAL JOURNAL, October, 1883. (Chicago.)—1. Native Races of Colombia; by E. Barney. 1. Mexican Antiquities; by L. P. Gratacap. 3. On the Gentile System of the Omahas; by Rev. J. Owen Dorsey. 4. Primitive North-West; by C. W. Butterfield. 5. Babylonian and Assyrian Art; by W. S. C. Boscawen.

AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1883. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Law of Prayer; by Most Rev. James Gibbons, D.D. 2. William M. Thackeray; by Prof. A. J. Faust, Ph.D. 3. The Church in Spain; by Rev. Bernard O'Reilly. 4. Who Wrote the "Imitation of Christ?" by Rev. Aug. J. Thebaud, S.J. 5. Bancroft's History of the United States; by John Gilmary Shea, LL.D. 6. Martin Luther. 7. What has Ireland Gained by Agitation? by John Boyle O'Reilly. 8. The Origin of Civil Authority; by Rev. John Ming, S.J. 9. The Philosophy of Introspection; by A. de G.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, November, December, 1883. (Cincinnati.)—1. The Worship of the Church; by A. J. Rowland, D.D. 2. Some Aspects of Early Protestant Theology; by Prof. Albert H. Newman. 3. Probation After Death; or, "The Spirits in Prison;" by Rev. C. F. Mussey, D.D. 4. The Six-Principle Baptists; by J. T. Smith, D.D. 5. The True Light of Asia; by John T. Perry.

CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW. October, 1883. (Columbia, Mo.)—1. The Temporary and the Permanent in Christianity; by A. I. Hobbs. 2. Christ—the Ideal Teacher; by J. W. Monser. 3. Exegetical; by J Tomline Walsh. 4. One Chapter in Theodicy—the Origin of Evil; by B. U. Watkins. 5. The Church as the Body of Christ; Unsectarian and Non-Denominational; by B. F. Manire. 6. Inspiration; by H. W. Everest. 7. A Criticism of Hall's

"Problem of Human Life;" by Clark Braden. 8. The Lesson of Paul's Life; by E. K. Miller. 9. Scriptural Status of the Apostleship; by G. R. Hand. 10. Among our Exchanges.

CHRISTIAN THOUGHT MONTHLY, November, 1883. (New York.)—1. The Lands of the Bible, Ancient and Modern; by Mr. Hormuzd Rassam. 2. Remarks on Mr. Rassam's Paper; by Howard Crosby, D.D. 3. Additional Remarks; by Prof. Francis Brown.

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1881. (Lebanon, Tenn.)—1. The Bible and Revision; by H. M. Irwin. 2. Inspiration of the Scriptures; by J. D. Kirkpatrick. 3. Spurious Zeal; or, Church Discipline; by Rev. J. H. Milholland. 4. True Education; by Rev. A. L. Barr. 5. The New Theology; by Rev. W. H. Black. 6. The Problem of Religious Progress; by B. W. M'Donnold. D.D., LL.D. 7. Christian Institutions; by S. G. Burney, D.D. 8. The New Revision; by Prof. D. M. Harris. 9. Date of the Origin of the Human Race; by S. H. Buchanan, D.D. 10. To Our Readers, (Editorial.) 11. Notes; by Prof. R. V. Foster.

JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY, October, 1883. (New York.)—1. Hospitality; by Andrew P. Peabody, D.D. 2. The Duty, Value, and Power of Positive Faith; by Samuel C. Bartlett, D.D. 3. The Authenticity of the Four Gospels; by Henry Wace, D.D. 4. The Modern Theory of Force *vs.* Materialism; by Rev. Joseph S. Van Dyke. 5. The Disbeliever Challenged; by Rev. Francis W. Ryder. 6. The Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch; by Very Rev. R. Payne-Smith, D.D. 7. The Ethics of Herbert Spencer; by A. Campbell Armstrong, Jun. 8. The Historical Chapters of Daniel Attested by Contemporary Records; by William Hayes Ward, D.D. 9. God's True Glory, and Man's Knowledge of It; by William H. Dallinger, LL.D.

JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS, June and December, 1882. (Middletown, Conn.)—1. Notes on the Beirût Syriac Codex; by Prof. I. H. Hall, Ph.D. 2. On Job xix, 25–27; by Rev. J. I. Mombert, .D.D. 3. An Examination of the Use of the Tenses in Conditional Sentences in Hebrew; by Rev. Henry Ferguson.

December.—1. The New Testament Witness to the Authorship of Old Testament Books; by Prof. Francis Brown. 2. Lost Hebrew Manuscripts; by Rev. B. Pick, Ph.D. 3. On בראׁ in Josh. xvii, 15, 18, and Ezek. xxi, 24; xxiii, 47; by Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D.D. 4. The Syriac Apocalypse; by Prof. Isaac H. Hall, Ph.D.

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, October, 1883. (Gettysburg.)—1. Of Free Will; by Prof. H. Louis Baugher, D.D. 2. The Relation of the Lutheran Church in the United States to the Lime-Stone Districts; by Rev. Sylvanus Stall, A.M. 3. History of the Lutheran Congregation at Frederick, Md.; by B. M. Schmucker, D.D. 4. Luther and Loyola—Their Influence on Men; by Alfred A. Mitchell, Esq. 5. Tendencies; by Rev. Edward T. Horn, A.M. 6. Standing in One's Lot at the End; by M. Valentine, D.D. 7. The Call to the Ministry; by F. W. Conrad, D.D.

NEW ENGLANDER, November, 1883. (New Haven.)—1. A Chapter of Connecticut Reminiscences: by Rev. I. N. Tarbox, D.D. 2. The Relations of the Church to the Colored Race; by Rev. Lewis Grout. 3. Revival Experiences during the Great Awakening in 1741–44, in New London County; by Rev. Wm. B. Cary. 4. The Influence of Infant Baptism on the Children Themselves; by Rev. Burdett Hart. 5. The Christian Consciousness; by Rev. Philo R. Hurd. 6. A Study of Cognition; by Miss Laura A. Luse. 7. The Paulicians; by Rev. William Clark. 8. The Method of Political Economy; by D. M'G. Means. 9. Prof. Harris's "Philosophical Basis of Theism;" by Rev. G. B. Stevens.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, October, 1883. (New York.)—1. Gold and Silver as Standards of Value; by Senator N. P. Hill. 2. Some Aspects of Democracy in England; by A. V. Dicey. 3. Co-operative Distribution; by Rev. Dr. R. Heber Newton. 4. Early Man in America; by Prof. W. Boyd Dawkins. 5. Astronomical Collisions; by Prof. C. A. Young. 6. The St. Patrick Myth;

by Moncure D. Conway. 7. Board of Trade Morality; by Van Buren Denslow. 8. Histories of the French Revolution; by Frederic Harrison. 9. Social Forces in the United States; by Rev. Dr. E. E. Hale.

November.—1. Limited Suffrage in Rhode Island; by Senator H. B. Anthony. 2. The Government and the Telegraph; by Dr. Norvin Green. 3. John Brown of Osawatomie; by Rev. David N. Utter. 4. Solar Physics; by Prof. Balfour Stewart. 5. Modern Explosives; by Gen. John Newton. 6. Conversations with a Solitary. Part III; by W. H. Mallock. 7. Suggestions in Regard to the Public Service; by Green B. Raum. 8. Dr. Hammond's Estimate of Woman; by Lillie Devereux Blake, Nina Morais, Sara A. Underwood, Dr. Clemence S. Lozier.

December.—1. Government Control of the Telegraph; by Gardiner G. Hubbard. 2. Causes of Felicity; by Dr. B. W. Richardson. 3. Evils of the Sub-Treasury System; by Prof. J. L. Laughlin. 4. The Day of Judgment. Part I; by Gail Hamilton. 5. Overproduction; by Henry George. 6. National Defense; by Gen. W. B. Franklin. 7. Railroad and Public Time; by Prof. Leonard Waldo. 8. Morality and Religion; by F. A. Kidder, Prof. A. A. Hodge.

OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT, September, 1883. (Chicago.)—1. Traces of the Vernacular Tongue in the Gospels, III.; by Prof. Franz Delitzsch. 2. The Literary Character of Amos; by Talbot W. Chambers, D.D. 3. The Battle Address of Abijah; by Rev. James L. Bigger, M.A., B.D. 4. Isaiah and the New Criticism; by Rev. C. N. Patterson. 5. The Old Hebrew Theology; by Rev. Nathaniel West.

October.—1. Is the Book of Jonah Historical? by Editor. 2. Modern Biblical Criticism; by Rev. Wm. Norman Irish. 3. Al-Tashheth; by Rev. Wm. H. Cobb. 4. Notes on the Targum as a Commentary; by Rev. M. Jastrow, Ph.D.

November.—Is the Book of Jonah Historical? II; by the Editor. 2. The Assyrian Literature and the Old Testament; by Prof. S. Burnham. 3. The Cuneiform Account of the Deluge; by Dr. Paul Haupt. 4. Ruth and the New Criticism; by Rev. Newell Woolsey Wells.

December.—1. Some Features of Messianic Prophecy Illustrated by the Book of Joel, I; by Prof. Edward L. Curtis. 2. The Results of Modern Biblical Criticism; by Prof. D. G. Lyon, Ph.D. 3. Chronological; Prof. H. G. Mitchell, Ph.D. 4. The Relation of the Old Testament to the New; by Rev. Wm. Burnett.

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, October, 1883. (New York.)—1. Milton and Tennyson; by Rev. Henry J. Van Dyke, Jun. 2. Hilary of Poitiers, and the Earliest Latin Hymns; by Rev. Samuel W. Duffield. 3. Studies in Eschatology; by Prof. Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D. 4. Presbyterian Worship; by Rev. R. M. Patterson, D.D. 5. The Psalter of Solomon; by Prof. Bernhard Pick, Ph.D.

PRINCETON REVIEW, November, 1883. (New York.)—1. The Abnegation of Self-Government; by Hon. Thomas M. Cooley, LL.D. 2. Divorce Reform; by Leonard Woolsey Bacon. 3. Tourgeneff; by Bayard Tuckerman. 4. The "Foreign Competitive Pauper Labor" Argument for Protection; by Hon. David A. Wells. 5. Currency Problems; by Worthington C. Ford. 6. The Critical Study of the Scriptures; by Rev. Francis A. Henry.

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH, October, 1883. (Macon, Ga.)—1. Revelation Sustained; by A. Means, D.D., LL.D. 2. Spontaneous Combustion. 3. A Free Ballot and a Fair Count; by Rev. J. M. Edwards. 4. Plurality of Inhabited Worlds; by Rev. E. A. Yates, D.D. 5. Facts Concerning the Resurrection; by Rev. O. A. Myers. 6. Lord Macaulay; by Rev. W. Jackson. 7. Worldliness and Other Worldliness; by Rev. W. Harrison. 8. Educational Problems in the South; by Prof. James C. Hinton, A.M. 9. The Problem of Life; Prof. J. M. Long, A.M.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, October, 1883. (Boston.)—1. The Jew—From the Maccabees to Christ. Part I; by Rev. A. G. Laurie 2. New Orthodoxy; or, the Tendency of Sin to Permanence. Part I; by Rev. Stephen Crane. 3. The Resurrection of the Dead; or, An Exegesis of the 15th of First Corinthians;

by W. E. Manley, D.D. 4. Maya Literature; by Rev. J. P. M'Lean. 5. A Personal God: Omnipresent; by Rev. Thomas Abbott. 6. The Bible; by G. T. Flanders, D.D.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, October, 1883. (Andover.)—1. Proposed Reconstruction of the Pentateuch; by Prof. Edwin C. Bissell, D.D. 2. Sociology and Christian Missions; by Rev. George Mooar, D.D. 3. Theism and Ethics; by Rev. Thomas Hill, D.D., LL.D. 4. Recent Theories of the Divine Foreknowledge; by Rev. Wm. Henry Cobb. 5. The Practical Bearings of our Belief Concerning the Relation of Death to Probation; by Rev. G. Frederick Wright. 6. The Brahma Samaj; by Rev. C. W. Park. 7. Ctesias of Cnidus; by Prof. H. A. Schomp.

Mr. Cobb's article on Divine Foreknowledge is clear, acute, and candid. It examines Dr. M'Cabe's theory of Nescience as well as those of Rothe and Dorner, and concludes that "the result of our Scripture examination is to negative decidedly" all three. But so obscure are the utterances, which he fully and freely quotes, of Dorner, that he concludes "that a clear statement of Dorner's real belief is a *desideratum.*" He gives a summary of Scripture texts on the subject which the investigator of the subject may find a valuable aid. Mr. Cobb, we may add by the way, is author of the remarkable arithmetical demonstration of the unity of Isaiah, in the Bibliotheca Sacra, noticed in a former number of our Quarterly.

The author also presents and discusses the view maintained in our volume upon the Will; giving copious and pertinent extracts, aiming evidently to give an accurate exhibit of our doctrine. He does not rank it in the unscriptural category. "It would be hazardous for any one to assert that Whedon's theory of divine foreknowledge is, on the face of it, contrary to Holy Scripture." Indeed, he professes "we go as far as any one in maintaining the power of alternate choice." But he affirms, "The Bible was not written for the purpose of furnishing proof-texts to either party." If Calvinists rightly insist on the absoluteness of God's plan of "election," Arminians rightly insist on "man's absolute freedom in the process."

Mr. Cobb quotes from Dr. M'Cabe's book on "Nescience" a sentence extracted from a private letter of ours, saying, "I have never made any objections to your view." He is induced therefrom to conjecture that our maintenance of divine foreknowledge may be purely hypothetical, and that we occultly mean: *if* foreknowledge be held it can thus be defended. This conjecture arises from the fact that this sentence is isolated from its context. Dr. M'Cabe certainly never understood

from us that we *had* subjectively no objections to his view, but that we had "never *made* any," either in this Quarterly or in our volume. Our mind has ever been very much coincident with that of the Cambridge Platonist, Dr. Henry More, that we hold firmly to divine foreknowledge, but if that be incompatible with human pre-responsibility we must, philosophically speaking, maintain the latter and not the former. Accordingly, in our volume we simply allude to the doctrine of Nescience, and without making "any objections" to it, declare that it is an unnecessary hypothesis, since freedom and foreknowledge are maintainable as compatible with each other.

Mr. Cobb expresses the doubt whether Edwards really taught *necessity*. He says our book is "an admirable polemic against necessity; yet many will refuse to grant that Edwards is properly classed with the fatalists, although his terminology alone might warrant that inference. It is not necessary to discuss here the perennial question whether Edwards does or does not hold to the true liberty of the Will." Now we wish he had discussed the question whether Edwards taught the doctrine of necessity, in the sense of the non-existence of the power of contrary choice. We have seen many a flat denial, but we have never seen any attempt to *disprove* that he was a rigid, unflinching necessitarian. And when we are told that our book disproves necessity, and remember that the main statements with which we took issue in so disproving were taken from Edwards with a most rigid scrutiny of the meaning of his words, and then learn that Edwards taught no necessity at all, we might at first feel quite chopfallen at committing such a miss-fire. But then, on second cheery thought, we might claim to have performed therein one of the most unique exploits in all literary history. Looking through the world of thought we could find no author who so fully and explicity teaches what we wished to refute as Edwards. Hobbes is generally accepted as necessitarian and fatalistic; but Hobbes does not express that doctrine with any thing like the clearness and force that Edwards does. And if any defender of Edwards is pleased to try the contest of quotations we think that for one clear unequivocal expression of the doctrine in Hobbes we could find from three to ten in Edwards. On page 29 of our volume we call attention to the fact that Edwards ridicules

those who hold to a "liberty *ad utrumvis*," or "*power of choosing differently in given cases*," as not knowing what they are talking about. And this *power of choosing differently in given cases* is just *that power of contrary choice* which Mr. Cobb holds to be anti-necessitarian freedom, thereby subjecting himself to Edwards's sharp sarcasm. Repeatedly, at successive statements of Edwards, we call attention to the unflinchingness of the fatalism. Thus, at p. 157, we give the following words of Edwards:

> If the acts of the Will are excited by motives, those motives are the *causes* of those acts of the Will; which makes the acts necessary; as effect necessarily follows the efficiency of the cause.

Now if that does not explicitly affirm necessity, will our Edwardian friends please give us a formula which does? At p. 221 we condense into a brief summary the statements of Edwards, which make it almost as wise to say that Euclid did not teach geometry as to say that Edwards did not teach necessity. Some twenty years ago we said that Edwards was the most unflinching fatalist that ever held a pen, and to the best of our knowledge and belief it is still true.

Mr. Cobb maintains that "knowledge is an essential attribute of God, but not foreknowledge. The latter respects a future certainty, which can be made certain only by God's decree. We can conceive him as a perfect God without foreknowledge." That is, he can at once be both omniscient and nescient! And that is precisely Dr. M'Cabe's theory. "A future certainty can be made certain only by God's decree." Why, then, in regard to a free agent, may not God withhold decree, and allow him to act freely as he pleases, God meanwhile voluntarily unknowing the acts? And why can he not create a system of free agents, and withhold all decree fixing their acts, and, freely unknowing what they will do, adjust his own plans so as to overrule their actions to the best results? And then what can Dr. M'Cabe want more to satisfy his nescience theory? It is in fact Dr. Adam Clarke's theory of divine voluntary nescience of the future acts of agents left to the freedom of their own will.

The following is our treatment of the sole difficulty of God's foreknowledge of the free act, with Mr. Cobb's reply:

P. 274. "The real difficulty (which we distinctly profess to leave forever insoluble), as may soon more clearly appear, is to conceive *how God came by that foreknowledge.* But that is no greater difficulty than to conceive how God came by his omnipotence or self-existence. It will be a wise theologian who will tell us how God came by his attributes." Dr. Whedon seems here to miss the point of the problem. When we inquire, "How can God draw his knowledge from an object not yet in existence, a zero?" we are not asking after a method, but suggesting a contradiction. The *how* resembles that in Matt. xii, 34, "How can ye, being evil, speak good things?"

But, we reply, a future *fact* is as knowable a reality as a future thing, or even a present thing, and so is no mere *zero.* The conception of such fact may exist, must exist, in the omniscient mind. A future fact is no more a zero than a past fact. The former is a matter of anticipation, the latter of memory. Even when it is decreed to be in the future, it is no more than a conception until it is accomplished. Nay, it must in the order of nature exist as a conception before it can be decreed. If the conception can be decreed to be in the future, why not foreknown? There is, then, no such "contradiction" as this foreknowing of a zero. The true difficulty, as we stated, is how the knowledge of a future free fact can be possible in omniscience. Or, rather, since a nescient Omniscience is no Omniscience at all, *How* is a complete Omniscience possible? Which is all the same as to ask of God's other attributes, How is complete omnipresence or omnipotence possible? But specifically it is asking, How can God look through time as man can look through space? It is, then, the question, *Quomodo?* And we may say that our power to look through space is as inconceivable to a blind mole as God's looking through time is to us. Our own non-possession of intuitive omniscience striking through time is the reason why we can shape no conception of it.

Man sees through time on a line of causations and through means of calculations and deductions. (See our "Will," page 129.) God sees through time independently of all such aids and props, by the pure intuitive power of omniscience. Of course Mr. Cobb will scout all idea of ascribing such an attribute to God; and so would our blind mole aforesaid scout Mr. Cobb's pretensions to looking through space. Why may

not God possess a vision as much above ours as ours above the mole, and as inconceivable to us as ours to him? And this is the true idea of omniscience. We mean not the idea of the eternal *now*, nor the notion that time has no reality; but the grand idea that all time, and all eternity, and all the eternities of eternities, *present* their contents to his open view, and are realized by him with a direct and perfect knowing. "All things are naked and opened to the eyes of Him with whom we have to do." They are not present to him by the annihilation of time, but seen by him in full perception of the distances and evolutions of time; so that the Gnosis of God pervades alike the eternities of time and the immensities of space. And this clear comprehensive view relieves us of all trouble in ascribing to God a direct knowing of the acts of alternative agents. For this *knowing* perceives not merely externalities, but the intrinsic natures and relations of things, and events, and realizes truly the act put forth with power-otherwise.

Mr. Cobb brings up the question, Does omniscience precede the act of decree, or *vice versa*? We say (as in the first article of this Quarterly) that, omniscience, being a divine attribute, in the order of nature and thought precedes the divine act, and so the decree is enacted in the full light of an antecedent omniscience. God does not decree in ignorance. He does not *create* any part or phase of his own omniscience. He knows, and in the order of nature foreknows, his own free act, just as I may know my own future free act.

To this Mr. Cobb replies in the words of the following paragraph. To each successive step of the process we affix a numeral, which refers to our reply marked with the same numeral.

We transport ourselves in thought to the distant eternity when God existed alone, and, admitting that his essential attributes *logically* precede his acts, we will overleap those acts, and endeavor to conceive of the divine mind in its essential knowledge, when the present order of creation was only one of many possible systems, among which God was to choose, when therefore God knew them all as possible, no one of them as actual; just as an architect may have a distinct vision of a dozen conceivable houses.[1] But Dr. Whedon arrests us in this endeavor, and asserts that the divine omniscience must eternally conform to whatever is certain in the future. Granting that there is no *chronological* separation between the knowledge of possibilities and of realities, we still insist, with Whedon himself, that volition must

logically come after perception.' Is not God at liberty to create what he will?' Can we not even conceive of his essential attributes without postulating our own existence? Dr. Whedon will hardly maintain that we cannot, in view of a statement which he makes in the interest of human freedom, (pp. 279, 280:) "An atheist is fully able to conceive a world of free agents without any omnipotent personal First Cause." So, then, we can conceive of man without God, but not of God without man![4] And not only so; for if foreknowledge be an *essential* divine attribute, then God could not be God without the certain existence of the meanest reptile that crawls on the ground.[5] The existence of all things as they are at present was *first* infallibly certain, and *then* —God deliberately chose the present world out of all possible worlds![6] *That* choice, at least, could not reflect itself back into the previous knowledge, for then the choice would be logically first, which is contrary to the supposition. The divine creative act was according to a divine thought into which no choice had entered, but which shaped infallibly the pattern to be followed.[7] The advocates of this doctrine must beware lest, in freeing man from his chains, they wrap them around his Creator.[8] —Pp. 686, 687.

(1) But the traditional view is that "God from all eternity decrees whatsoever comes to pass." The omniscience and the decree are, therefore, co-eternal, and oblige us to find God eternally in the state of freely choosing for the best, just as he is eternally in the state of omniscience. There can, therefore, be no anterior period of God's ignorance of any free acts, even his own. And so eternally the act is in the order of thought subsequent to the attribute. Mr. Cobb's theory is compelled to suppose a pre-existent nescience, a mutilated omniscience, waiting for the construction of God's divine theory before it is able to know. But, in fact, these conceptions of God on a certain occasion making a comparison of worlds, and choosing the best one, do not presuppose an actual transaction once occurring, preceded by divine ignorance. They are simply devices to aid our own thought. (2) Yes; just as the divine decree must come after the full omniscience. (3) This argues that God's omniscience as including his own act destroys the liberty of his act. And yet our author tells us on the very next page: "His *knowledge* of all future motives, and accordingly *of all free choices* as certain to be realized, . . . gives the system of liberty." That is, God's knowledge of future free acts does not destroy their freedom; and so his knowledge of his own

free acts does not destroy their freedom. God is to be conceived as freely and eternally choosing the best possible system, and plenarily knowing and foreknowing within his own divine consciousness that he will do so. His omniscience and his purpose, as in nature antecedent and consequent, eternally fuse with each other, eternal knowledge and eternal act. In our chapter on "Freedom of Divine Will" we say: "Eternity bears to God the same relation as an hour bears to man; and it no more follows that God's volitions are bound by fixed law from his *will*-ing eternally right, than it follows that man's volitions are fixed by law because he wills right through sixty seconds." God's "unchange*ableness*" is his free unchang*ingness* with eternal full power to change; his immutability is his eternal free volition not to mutate. (4) It is perfectly easy to conceive God as eternally willing not to create man; just as Mr. Cobb holds, as we suppose, that it was perfectly competent for God to foreordain from all eternity that man should not exist. And just as we may conceive a man for an hour willing or not willing to make a clock. Does Mr. Cobb admit that the eternity of God's foreordination destroys the freedom of God? (5) No difficulty in conceiving God eternally willing the "reptile" not to exist, and eternally knew he would. (6) Whichever the enacted choice, that would be the foreknown choice. (7) Not "the choice," but the knowledge or idea of the choice, "would be logically first." (8) No. Not "shaped," but shapes to "the pattern followed." (9) And yet Mr. Cobb holds that God foreknows the free choices of men, as he says on this very page. He has declared, "We go as far as any Arminian in maintaining alternate choice." And yet he here stoutly maintains that the foreknowledge of the choice destroys the alternity. And this again seems like an indorsement of Dr. M'Cabe. On our view there is no difficulty in the matter. It is of the very property and power of perfect omniscience, that the alternative choice should be the one embraced within its knowledge, without destroying its alternity.

Mr. Cobb introduces a fine old Puritan writer, Charnock, with extracts clearly demonstrating that he held "the power of contrary choice." All that is lovely. But soon comes a terrible catastrophe. In other extracts this same Charnock avows the doctrine of predestination, which makes God's

decree annul, with all the might of his pledged omnipotence, this very power of contrary choice. What boots it, we pray you, to take off the shackles of necessitation from the will, and then clap on the fetters of predestination upon the Will? What worth is a power of choice which abuts against the decree of God? There can be no "alternate choice" if God's power has secured that none but one given choice can take place. God's decree forecloses, crushes out, and annihilates the "contrary power." It is an issue between the contrary choice and omnipotence. The reprobate sinner is hemmed in to his reprobate choice, and to his reprobate doom. God has decreed his sin, and damns him for committing the sin decreed. And this decree is very specially denied to take shape from the foreknowledge; the decree creates the foreknowledge, and the foreknowledge is shaped by the decree.

And in this same awful inconsistency Mr. Cobb fearfully involves himself. He traces (p. 687) the process of divine government by stages of which the fourth and fifth are as follows: "His [God's] act of will, according to which certain beings are endowed with freedom, and surrounded with objects appealing to choice; his knowledge of future motives, and accordingly of all free-choices as *certain* to be realized. This gives the system of liberty." Now, of the connection between the "motives" and the "choices" three things are predicated. First. It is so strong that the very scheme of divine government can safely rest upon it. Second. It is so strong that it can bear to have the decree of predestination fastened and based upon it. Third. There emerges this contradiction that the "knowledge of future motives" and "free-choice" is here made the basal condition of the decreed "system," and yet the decree is held by Mr. Cobb to be the precedent condition of the "knowledge." Now we beg leave to doubt that, holding to all those annihilators of the power of contrary volition, Mr. Cobb can accurately claim to "go as far as any Arminian in maintaining the power of alternate choice." The moment you introduce predestination you cancel all freedom.

In summarizing calmly his conclusions whether this "traditional" Calvinian theodicy should be amended, our friendly critics final objection to our "theory" is that it gives us "an unfree Creator forming a free creature." That is, God's endowing man

with ample scope of unviolated freedom sufficient to render him justly responsible renders him an "unfree creator." We wish Mr. Cobb had fully weighed our two chapters entitled "Freedom limits not Omnipotence," and "Freedom exalts Man and dishonors God?" where that objection is analyzed. We there show that the outfit of free agency furnished to man by God was no abdication or diminution of divine power, but simply a munificent divine self-limitation of action *in the use of that power*. Even in the imposition of physical laws upon the material mechanism of creation God imposes the most absolute laws upon his own action. He binds himself by the same adamantine laws with which he binds mechanical nature. If he will have a permanent course of nature he must hold himself "unfree" to violate that course of nature. He cannot both maintain and violate. If that is to be "unfree," God is as unfree as the clod of the valley, the rock in our Palisades, or the orrery of the solar system revolving in its orbits. Is it "unfree" in God to uniformly and forever avoid a capricious break-up of the system of nature as a boy knocks to pieces his Christmas block-house? The human mechanist *obeys his machine;* and so does the divine, and thereby both are far more free and illustrious. Even if God determines to have a system of necessitated human agents he must hold himself just as unfree to violate the law of necessity as he is "unfree" to violate the law of freedom in a system of responsible free agents. And in the realm of responsible beings: the greater the power and freedom conferred upon the agent, the higher does God himself rise above the grade of a mere master mechanist to a divine imperial Ruler. The higher, the richer, the endowment bestowed, the nobler is the dignity of the "divine sovereignty." For God to grant all the capacities necessary to a due responsibility is simply for him to most freely take upon himself the principles of eternal wisdom and righteousness. It is a voluntary unfreedom, a free unfreedom. On the other hand, the "traditional" Augustinian view makes God too covetous of his power to allow a freedom requisite for responsibility. God is made to talk largely of freedom, responsibility, and penalty, and damnation; but when it comes to the freedom, the pseudo-free action is scrimped, and necessitated, and predestinated, and determined, and made "certain," before-

hand, like the automatic figures of a chess-board, all to save God from being "unfree" and without attaining that result. It represents God like a tradesman who might win a million, but is too penurious to lay out the necessary investment. God's freedom, we maintain, consists in the largeness of his liberalities, in the nobleness of his divine self-limitations as a ruler, in the richness of the powers he bestows upon the subjects by him held responsible. And in the fullness of those powers for which he holds his subjects responsible is the true grandeur of his "divine sovereignty." We conclude that in honor of the divine Sovereign the "traditional" Augustinian theory needs summary abolition.

Finally this objection that our "theory" gives "an unfree Creator forming a free creature" evolves something like another contradiction. Mr. Cobb declares he "will go as far as any one," even as far as we, "in maintaining the power of alternate choice;" and yet it seems we go it so far as to hold "an unfree Creator." Which "horn," then, does Mr. Cobb accept? Our "alternate choice?" Then he has "an unfree God." Does he assert a free "Creator?" Then by his own account he must reject the "alternate choice." We have a shade of doubt whether our candid friend has as clear and firm belief in "alternate choice" as he himself.

English Reviews.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1883. (London.)—1. The London Quarterly Review: New Series. 2. Professor Palmer. 3. The Completed Church Books of Wesleyan Methodism. 4. Republican France and Religion. 5. The Official Year-Book of the Church of England. 6. Hopes and Fears for Madagascar. 7. The Luther Festival; by Dr. Philippi.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1883. (London.)—1. The Life and Times of St. Anselm; by John Gibb. 2. Some Indian Stories; by W. R. S. Ralston. 3. Life Insurance Finance. 4. Among the Mongols. 5. Cromwell in Ireland; by T. C. D. 6. The Four Hundredth Birthday of Luther; by George P. Fisher. 7. Mr. Roden Noel's Poems; by Daniel C. Angus. 8. The Dog in Homer; by A. M. Clarke. 9. The Second Part of "Faust": a Study; by M. Betham Edwards. 10. Mr. Ilbert's Bill; by Wm. Summers. 11. Political Review of the Quarter.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, October, 1883. (London.)—1. Proposed Substitutes for Christianity; by Prof. J. Radford Thomson, M.A. 2. Canon Cook's Criticism of the Revised Version of the Three First Gospels; by Principal Brown. 3. Studies in Scottish Ecclesiastical Biography; by Rev. Charles G. M'Crie. 4. Was Aërius a Heretic? by Rev. Thomas Witherow. 5. The Nature of Physical Causes and their Induction; by Prof. R. L. Dabney, D.D., LL.D. 6. Christianity and Buddhism; by Prof. S. H. Kellogg, D.D.

German Reviews.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN. (Theological Essays and Reviews.) 1884. First number.—*Essays:* 1. HAUPT, The Life of Jesus: by B. Weiss. 2. FRANKE, The Sphere of the Johannean Gospel. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. KLOSTERMANN, Alteration of the Text of the Psalm of Hezekiah, in Isaiah xxxviii, 9–20. 2. TAG, An Exposition of Luke xviii, 7, and Galatians ii, 3–6. *Review:* SCHRADER, The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament; reviewed by RÖSCH.

KIRCHLICHE MONATSCHRIFT, (Church Monthly.) Vol. 2, No. 12.—1. H. SCHMIDT, Church Heresy and the Sects. 2. FRICK, Guide to the Teaching of Homiletics for the Theologians of the Francke Foundation in Halle. 3. MARTINS, The Soldier and the Sabbath: a Contribution to the Sabbath Observance Question. From East and West Prussia. Monthly Review. Programme for the Luther Celebration in Wittemberg.

The leading article in the first of the above periodicals is an exhaustive criticism on the "Life of Jesus," by Bernard Weiss. This now famous work has already been so much criticised and reviewed, on account of its equivocal character, that it may be pleasing to our readers to learn how an orthodox publication presents it to the German public. The work itself appeals to an extensive circle of readers among the cultured and intelligent classes, and also to the smaller circle of the specially scientific and theological.

"Weiss places himself in sharp contrast to the so-called 'modern theology' which does not believe in miracles in the strict sense of the term, by confessing to the existence of a Christ who is more than a mere man, even the highest and most unattainable. On the other hand, he separates himself from the usual Church circle, by resting his views on a historically critical treatment of the gospels, by a presentation of the life of Christ from the stand-point of his earthly and historical life. On account of this double position, Weiss expresses the fear that his book will find a favorable reception from neither of the theological tendencies. And unfavorable criticisms have not been wanting. Weiss frequently wrestles with inexactitudes and errors in treating of the miracles; but this is all pardoned by some in view of his exact treatment of many ecclesiastical truths, as the pre-existence of Christ, his immaculate birth, and his resurrection. The *external* success which Weiss has gained is largely owing to this direction. The *external* success, for the internal success is by no means assured. This can only be settled when the principles represented by him are accepted in broader circles; and how far this will be the case is yet doubt-

ful. Only the futnre can show whether a large circle of readers will be induced, through his book, to give up their principal stand-point, or whether they will simply accept his aid to reach their results, but in other matters refuse to follow in his ways and look to his aims."

This same number of the "Theological Essays" closes with a review of Schrader's work on the "Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament," which has just been issued in a new and enlarged edition, with a supplement by Prof. Paul Haupt, the famous young Assyriologist, now of the Johns Hopkins University of Baltimore. This new edition has been largely increased and greatly improved by the criticisms that the first edition received from several distinguished Orientalists, so that it has become, in Germany, the standard work on the matter of these now widely-known inscriptions. This new edition contains about two hundred pages more than the original, presenting in these added pages an Excursus containing the transcription, translation, and exegesis of the cuneiform description of the Flood, together with a glossary belonging to it.

In consequence of the increase of the Assyriological parallel Bible passages, the number of the compared quotations has largely increased. The body of the book contains, therefore, in the order of the chapters, all the passages that are illustrated in any measure by the cuneiform parallels. The Excursus has four chronological supplements referring to so many different reigns. To these are added two linguistic supplements, a glossary by Haupt, and one by Schrader himself. There are also numerous additions and corrections in the registers, showing how every day, almost, brings some new matter or discovery to this interesting handmaid of biblical exposition. In conclusion, the master map-maker of Germany—Kiepert—is present with a most complete map of Mesopotamia, from the Armenian mountains to the Persian Gulf, and also from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates. The cartoons of Nineveh are also greatly improved in comparison with those in the earlier edition.

As we examine the contents we find them divided into sections treating of the geography, history, religion, and language involved in an accurate study of the subject. In the geographical section the question as to the location of Paradise is treated in harmony with the views of Friedrich Delitzsch and Fritz

Hommel; that is, it is laid in the region of Babylon. This view, they claim, is sustained by one of the cuneiform inscriptions, and the reasons given are based on linguistic, geographical, and mythological research. Turning from the question of the site of Paradise to that of genealogy, we find a thorough revision. The period after the flood has now its parallels from an old Babylonian list of kings found among the cuneiform inscriptions; some new names are even introduced from the cuneiform lists. In the field of history the author begins with cuneiform parallels for the biblical account of the creation. At the flood Schrader makes a very interesting comparison between the agreements and the disagreements of the biblical story and that of the inscriptions. The result reached by Schrader is, that the biblical account of the Flood stands in closer harmony with the Chaldaic story than could have been expected. On the whole, the work is a very rare product of some of the first biblical scholars of the world, and goes marvelously far in supporting Bible history by these profane inscriptions.

French Reviews.

REVUE CHRÉTIENNE, (Christian Review.) August, 1883.—1. MOURON, Fiftieth Anniversary of the Evangelical Association. 2. In Africa, by X. 3. BRIDEL, Philosophical Chronicle. 4. ROERICH, Literary Notices. 5. Monthly Review by Pressensé.

September, 1883.—1. AGUILERA, The Future of Religion. 2. In Africa, by X. 3. Sabatier, Literary Chronicle. 4. NYEGAARD, English Chronicle. 5. Review of the Month by Pressensé.

October, 1883.—1. E. DE PRESSENSÉ, Conciliation in Theology. 2. In Africa, by X. 3. DRAUSSIN, Protestant Literature and Book-selling. 4. Monthly Review by Pressensé.

In the August number of the *Revue* we find an interesting and instructive article on the establishment and growth of the Evangelical Association of France. It is virtually an address delivered quite recently on the occasion of the semi-centennial celebration of the society. Fifty years ago, under the heavy pressure that still kept the Protestant Church in the background, and did not even permit it to hold as a Church any general meetings or synods, a few zealous Christians determined to adopt the custom of Switzerland, England, and the United States, and establish an organization with the view to

advance and consolidate the cause of Protestant Christianity. With much trial and discouragement to contend with they nevertheless at last succeeded in effecting a reunion of a few of the Protestant leaders of the day to consult in regard to the enterprise. Among these we find the revered names of Frederic and Victor Monod, and E. de Pressensé. They had scarcely made the first step in their organization before they were encouraged by the greetings of similar bodies from Switzerland, Ireland, and England, as well as the United States. This step put them in *rapport* with the Protestant Christians, and their words of encouragement induced them to study the methods of these sister Churches for the propagation of the Gospel. In due time they had a Bible society and colporteurs, and were fairly on the good and active path. But this activity stirred up opposition in certain quarters, and soon certain of their colporteurs were arrested, and the penal code was brought to bear on their assemblies and their agents. Magistrates would put injunctions on them that wise judges would remove as illegal and not in accordance with the spirit of the code, and so they floated through stormy seas with an occasional wreck of their frail bark high and dry on the sand.

Under such adverse winds it was thought at times that the society must yield up its existence, but in these hours of trial there were always a few determined ones whom no opposition could crush or threats intimidate. These kept the leaven alive until the storm had passed, when they again tried the high seas, sometimes to sail smoothly for awhile, and then again to be buffeted by other storms. And these vicissitudes tell the sum of the story of well nigh forty years. When the Second Empire fell, Protestantism bounded forth like a spring that had long been under pressure. Bells that had been under a forced silence now pealed forth their tones to call together Christian brothers animated by new hopes; schools that had long been closed now opened their doors, and the Protestant chapels again dared to sing aloud their fervent hymns. When Protestantism was again allowed to move abroad it seemed as if liberty were in the air and new hopes inspired the hearts of men. In Paris, the workmen came in crowds to listen to Gospel words, and in the provinces new stations were opened to proclaim the name of the living God.

This society immediately received the privilege to preach and circulate its publications every-where, and it has used these opportunities with great effect. Now the cry is for workmen for the harvest, and for means to carry on the various enterprises of the associations. The object of this semi-centennial meeting was to review the past and animate the present into renewed vigor in view of the growing demands of the future. What they most need just now is money to carry on their enterprises. And this is coming now from England and America.

The article in the October number, on the literature and the book-sellers of Protestantism, reveals some of the wants and difficulties with which the aggressive movements of French Protestants have to contend. They find themselves devoid of implements with which to forward their cause in the dearth of good religious books for the instruction of their higher institutions, as well as their schools and families.

To remedy this defect they at first resorted to the method of encouraging as far as possible a Protestant establishment in private hands, and this mode was warmly seconded by some of the first men of the Protestant ranks. It seemed, however, not to move with any degree of celerity, and the cry went forth for some process more rapid and practical and popular. And therefore, about five years ago, the religious press announced the formation of a Committee resolved to undertake the reprint of a series of works on history and theology, to which they fittingly gave the title of *Classics of French Protestantism.* The names of the members of this Committee were a guarantee for the character of the works that would be published.

The enterprise of this association was in the course of execution, and was to be inaugurated by the Ecclesiastical History of Theodore Bèze, which was the fruit of twenty-five years of exhaustive labor of one of the most learned men in the Protestant ranks, and not, of course, as a means of making money, for no sale of such a book in France would be possible to an extent to make it a profitable enterprise pecuniarily. While this work was in the course of execution there was suddenly formed, in the south of France, a society for the publication of cheap religious books, which announced as its first

issue a popular edition of this same work. The members of the above Committee represented in vain that such an impediment thrown across their path would prevent them from making a success of the endeavor to do good work and select desirable books; but their appeal was in vain, and so the matter stands at present without compromise.

ART. X.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE PROTESTANT CHURCHES OF ITALY.

THE Protestant Churches of Italy are just now embarrassed by a very peculiar circumstance, namely, the abolition of paper money and the introduction of gold. For many years the premium of the precious metal has been so high that the face value of a draft to the missions was much greater than the strict figures of the draft; but now a draft for five hundred dollars only draws that amount at the bankers, instead of drawing well nigh six hundred, and this deficit in the missionary treasury is becoming a very serious matter. Under it the Waldenses especially are appealing for more funds from their friends in this country. A recent tabulation of the Protestant Churches in Italy presents the following figures:

	1878.	1883.	Increase.
Waldensian Churches	2,530	3,421	991
Free Church	1,649	1,666	17
Wesleyan Methodists	1,276	1,451	175
American Methodists	437	707	270
Baptists of various shades	(?)	847	497 (?)

So that now the entire number of Church members of various evangelical denominations in Italy amounts to 8,092, and we surmise that there has been a large increase on this figure during the year 1883.

The Italian Protestant press has for some time been discussing the project of the association of all the evangelical denominations of the land into one Church body, or rather into one organic federation. The organ of the Free Church in Venice, "The Fra Paola Sarpi," exclaims: "The members of our parishes will rejoice on the day when their ministers will lead them hand in hand to the same living pastures and fresh waters." In the Waldensian organ, "L'Italia Evangelica," Teofile Gay proposes, with certain restrictions, the following mode of confederation: (1) Every denomination which enters the confederation will remain fully autonomous in all that regards its ecclesiastical and financial administration. (2) The confederated denominations will in future divide among themselves the fields of labor not yet occupied, and will in them only establish new stations. (3) The confederated Churches will mutually recognize the leaders and members of the other Churches in their

respective qualities as pastors, evangelists, and Church members in communion. (4) Each of the confederated Churches binds itself to accept no member that has belonged to one of the other confederated Churches without the previously expressed permission of the Church in question. (5) The confederated Churches unite in the exchange of preachers, in periodical assemblies, in a common organ, and in common synods composed of all the Churches of the confederation, meeting triennially or quadrennially. (6) This confederation will be controlled by a central committee, to consist of one or two from each of the denominations to be named by their representatives in the synod. This committee remains in activity in the interim of the sessions in the general synods. (7) This central committee will take measures to create a single and complete theological faculty, in which the clergy of all denominations will receive their preparation, and will do whatever else that may forward the aim of the confederation.

The author of this proposition hoped to see the preparations for this work of union so far advanced as to be able to have the constituent assembly of this confederation to meet on the occasion of the principal Luther festival of Protestant Italy in Rome or Florence. This project seems very attractive to most of the Italian Protestants, and they sincerely hope that its execution may be speedily effected. The greatest obstacle to its advancement will be probably found in the differences that exist between the Free Church supported mainly by Scotch funds, and the Churches of the Waldenses.

THE BELGIAN MISSION CHURCH.

We notice with extreme pleasure the zealous earnestness and loving activity of the Protestant Church of Belgium. In the midst of this land of ultramontane gloom the work of Protestant missions shines forth like a bright light. At a meeting of this body recently held in one of the industrial sections of Belgium, the fiery tongues of the promoters of the mission work seemed inspired with the energy of the brawny arms of their working masses. The Protestant pastors on this occasion scarcely found it necessary to appeal for assistance in the work. The improved condition of the financial situation has enabled most of the parishes to reduce their floating debt and to increase their subscription for the instruction of their children in the Protestant faith in the Sunday-schools, and to make an advance in their subscriptions for the mission work. The most interesting features of the occasion were the exercises connected with the withdrawal of Rev. Leonard Annel from the work that he has conducted with signal success for the last forty years among the Protestants of Belgium. He was for a long time pastor in Brussels, and at the same time general secretary for the evangelical Church in Belgium, which is emphatically a mission work amid the ignorance and superstition of the Catholic Church. An untiring activity, a rare fidelity, and an inimitable spirit of self-sacrifice have at last exhausted his powers, and bidden him cease from his labors and seek

for rest. By common consent he has been placed upon the retired list and roll of honor as missionary *emeritus*.

But the armor that he lays down has been taken up by a young and active worker, and the cause moves on apace. Here, also, the Scotch Church is doing a grand work with its missionary funds; and prominent members of its organization were present to express their thanks to the veteran Christian laborer who had used them with so much judgment and success. Wishes and prayers for the increased prosperity of the Belgium Mission Church came from many hearts in that land, and, it is believed, find a place even in the heart of its king. The glorious enterprises undertaken by Leopold II. in the wilds of Africa, under his lieutenant and mouth-piece, the indefatigable Stanley, have inspired the Belgian Protestants to prepare themselves for the work that is soon likely to be ready for their hands on the banks of the Congo.

THE OLD CATHOLICS IN BADEN.

The Old Catholics of Germany seem to hold their own in Baden with more tenacity than in any of the other States. They lately held a state convention for the purpose of a close inspection of the situation. Their bishop, Dr. Reinkens, was present with them, and preached with fervor before a large congregation. Thirty-two parishes of Baden were represented in this convention by one hundred and thirty delegates. Besides their presiding bishop there were also present their general vicar, an Anglican clergyman, and one of the evangelical Protestant faith. The State's attorney of Baden from its capital, Carlsruhe, was the presiding officer. A professor from Austria made an interesting report on the politico-ecclesiastical condition in that country, and two other professional delegates treated of the position and the character of its literature and of its press.

The national committee proposed to make a collection for episcopal support, and also for the assistance of poor parishes and the formation of new ones, on Whit-Sunday, of each year, which is a period of high festival with the German nation. Certain resolutions published in their official organ, "The Old Catholic Messenger," were indorsed, according to which the opposition of the Old Catholics, not only to the infallibility of the Pope, but to the entire Romish system, with all its abuses and misleading tenets, were asseverated. A lasting peace between the State and the Pope was declared impossible, and the speeches of the Ultramontanes in the imperial Parliament and in the respective State diets was declared to be the product of a supercilious policy of expediency. It is declared to be untrue that the Roman Catholic is independent of the Pope in the political field, and that every act of any government whereby the common use of Catholic churches was withdrawn from, or denied to, the Old Catholics must result in strengthening the Ultramontanes and weakening the civil power. Again, it was asserted that every one in Germany who awakens or stirs up confessional conflict, be he Catholic or Protestant,

is an enemy of the fatherland; and that only in the false belief that Romish policy is the Catholic religion could statesmen legislate for the care of the souls of the people with Rome.

At a banquet held on the closing evening, Professor Michelis offered to go for a few weeks to Bohemia, where recently several parishes had declared themselves ready to enter the ranks of the Old Catholics. Professor Watterich narrated the struggle of Luther against the Hildebrand papacy. A Protestant pastor favored the union between Old Catholics and Protestants, which suggestion and proposition was critically explained by Bishop Reinkens. It would seem, from the above proceedings, that the Old Catholics are not yet losing hope of a certain success in the future, but the conquests that they are now making are of a very equivocal character. We opine that the parishes of Bohemia that declare themselves ready to throw off the papal yoke, and join hands with the Old Catholics, do so more in a fit of anger at tyrannical priestly rule than from well-grounded conviction. The Old Catholics are now virtually between two fires, for the Protestant Church of Germany is greatly disappointed that they do not go far enough in their opposition to the papacy to be of any influence in the cause of Protestantism, and are thus deserting their cause, ecclesiastically and politically, while the Catholics are taking advantage of the situation, and are crowding them out of the Catholic churches, in which they have hitherto enjoyed common privileges.

Art. XI.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

In the line of French Theological Literature the book of the period is the "Ecclesiastical History of the Reformed Churches in the Kingdom of France," by Theodore De Béze—a new edition, with additions by Baum and Cunitz, Professors in the University of Strasburg. This monumental edition of the book of the religious history of the sixteenth century is published under the patronage of the Society for the History of French Protestantism, and with the collaboration of a committee composed of Alfred André. Eugène Bersier, Jules Bonnet, Henri Bordier, Maurice Cottier, Count Jules Delaborde, Alfred Franklin, J. Gaiffe, C. Jameson, William Jackson, Fr. Lichtenberger, Henri Lutteroth, William Martin, G. de Montbrison, Rosseeuw-Saint-Hilaire, E. Suyons, Baron Fernand de Schickler. The plan of this publication was conceived five years ago. The very numerous notes, borrowed for the most part from a copy annotated by the late Professor Baum, of Strasburg, have been carefully gathered, revised, and enlarged by Professor Cunitz of Strasburg. Jules Bonnet has been delegated by the above-named committee to overlook the printing of these volumes. The work will be complete in three quarto volumes, forming together more than 3,000 pages. The printing of the second volume is almost completed. It will, doubtless,

become the standard in the public libraries, and in the libraries of the consistories, of scholars, of pastors, of bibliophiles.

Another monumental work in the same line, published by subscription, by Fischbacher, of Paris, is the "Dictionary of Ecclesiastical History," by PASTEUR BOST. We are aware of the considerable development which has taken place during the last fifty years in historical sciences, even in the domain purely ecclesiastical and religious. If the epoch of the Reformation first justly fixed the attention of our scholars and writers in beginning, by the *Chroniquer* of 1835 and 1836, to end in the great works of Reuss, of Herminjard, of Haag, of Douen, of Merle d'Aubigné, of de Félice, of Puaux, of Jules Bonnet, without forgetting the precious bulletin of French Protestantism, other periods have been equally elucidated; monographs and biographies have been multiplied, given by humble or by eminent investigators, whose names are legion. This collection of sketches and fragments prepared and made desirable a complete and analytical history of the Church, written by a historian worthy of the name. This man was found in the person of Professor Chastel, whose works and previous publications had engaged the attention of the learned world. This gentleman placed 8,500 pages of his manuscript at the disposition of Edmond de Pressensé, who writes thus about it: "My dear friend, what I have seen of your historical dictionary appears to me to demonstrate its utility and excellent arrangement, and its publication will present genuine advantages." Another critic, Pasteur Perrelet, speaks thus: "I have had the privilege of examining the manuscript of the work which Augustin Bost is about to give to the public after fifteen years of labor. This ecclesiastical and theological dictionary is a vast library contained in a thousand pages, a veritable fortune to all those who shall possess it, and they will be numerous."

The Luther revival has produced a tidal wave of so-called Luther literature. Several of these works are replies to recent Romish attacks on Luther's fair fame. A very notable publication in this line is an address by Dr. Martin Rade, at the Conference of Meissen, in reply to the oft-asked question, Does Luther need defense against Janssen, his most determined and prominent vilifier? The address culminates in these two striking answers: From the stand-point of the historian—No! From that of the theologian—Yes! The scientific method of Janssen, if such it can be called, has been condemned and executed, and needs no further contradiction; but that such a book should attract the attention in Protestant circles which it clearly has, must create serious apprehensions from the stand-point of the theologian. This ultramontane distortion of history has been effected by Janssen, with all the air of innocence, and this makes of the book "a stupendous invitation for the conversion of all intelligent Protestants." Against his falsehoods and seductive reasonings Dr. Rade prescribes the careful reading of all that Janssen has written, on the one hand, and then all the careful reading of Luther's writings.

"Zöckler's Manual of Theological Science," to which we have previously alluded in these pages, has just been enriched by another volume. This contains Old Testament theology, by Professor Schultz, in Breslau, an Introduction to the New Testament, and a Biblical History of the New Testament. Professor Grau has an article on New Testament theology, while Volck, of Dorpat, treats of canonical doctrine and biblical hermeneutics. The section under the charge of Volck is the most satisfactory and systematic as to the dialectics of the thoughts. The Old Testament theology, by Schultz, seems to be more acceptable to German critics. The work is very abstruse, and intelligent readers are requested to appreciate the difficulties that have attended these investigations.

ART. XII.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Biblical.

The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture. A Critical, Historical, and Dogmatic Inquiry into the Origin and Nature of the Old and New Testaments. By GEORGE T. LADD, D.D., Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Yale College. Vol. i, 8vo, pp. 761. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883. 1.

By *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture* Dr. Ladd means the true doctrine or teaching in regard to the Scripture; and his book professedly aims to answer the question, "What *is* the Bible?" But, more definitely, it attempts to answer the question, What opinion shall we form of the Bible, in view of the present debate between the school of Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen, and the "traditional" maintainers of the high Biblicism of the Post-Reformation era? Dr. Ladd, as an eminent Yale professor, may be assumed to be a master of the scholarship of the question; and as for years a pastor claims to have some perception of the true needs of the popular mind. He takes ample space for a full discussion of all the phases of the great question. His two volumes embrace about fifteen hundred pages; fifteen of which are devoted to an analytical table of contents, shedding great lucidity through the massy volumes, fifteen pages to a list of quoted texts, and twenty-four to an index of topics. The work is a "liberal education" upon its topic, or, rather, generic range of topics. Even those who dissent, more or less, from the author's views will respect the clearness, candor, thoroughness, and critical ability of the learned author, and we doubt not it will make a decided impression upon the public mind.

Between Kuenen and his extreme opponents Dr. Ladd takes

professedly a medium ground. His position, generically stated, would be, not that "The Bible *is* the word of God," but that "The Bible *contains* the word of God." Within the visible canon there is "an inner Bible" revealing supernatural ethico-religious truth in its purity, but surrounded by an outer margin which is not infallible nor always accurate. The "inner Bible," "the word of God," speaks in self-evidencing clearness and power, from the Spirit of God to the spirit of man, especially to the regenerate spirit. It is God revealing himself, and revealing Christ and his kingdom, with all its glories, to men. If this inner Bible is inclosed in earthen vessels, if surrounded by a margin partly or wholly human, the true inquirer can readily distinguish the true word from the vehicle that holds it. Our faith in the word, therefore, need never tremble at the disclosure of mistakes of chronology, contradictions to history, discrepancies between its own narratives, human conceptions, and traditional legends. Through all these, indeed, more or less, the divine word is breathed, making even error and myth the vehicle of divine truth. Besides, several books of our Bible are of doubtful canonicity, and so of inferior authority. But the body of holy truth is ample and intact after all these deductions.

To ascertain what the Bible is, he asks, in his first six elaborate chapters, What does the Bible claim for itself? He commences Christo-centrically, and critically analyzes the words of Christ to find his opinions of the character of the Old Testament, and his promises for the inspiration of the New. Similarly he analyzes the claims set up by the Old Testament for itself, and by the New Testament for the Old and for itself. These claims he finds to be far more qualified and limited than our Protestant "traditionalism" has taught. The classical text regarding Inspiration (2 Tim. iii, 16) is thus rendered: "All Scripture, theopneustic, is also profitable for the ethical purposes of teaching, conviction, correction, discipline, in righteousness." The passage is said to allude to the Old Testament only, "and although it is not the intent of the writer to suggest the possibility of denying theopneusty to any Scripture whatever, neither is it his intent to imply such theopneusty of any such Scripture as is not morally profitable."

After having ascertained the claims made for the Canon, our author proceeds to answer the inquiry, How do the contents of the Canon sustain its claims? The body of responses arising from this inductive investigation is elaborate and immense.

Scripture is scrutinized in the various departments of History, Prophecy, Ethics, Authorship, and Composition of the Sacred Books, their Language and Style, and the History and Text of the Canon. This much in the first volume.

The freedom of dealing with the outer Bible which his inductions afford him is amply displayed in his treatment of his topics. The first chapter of Genesis, whether ante-Mosaic, Mosaic, or post-Exilic, is entirely unscientific. So far from attempting to reconcile it with geology, he simply traces in it how an ancient pious monotheistic thinker would imagine the successive steps of the creational process. The history of the Fall is allegory, nor have we clearly ascertained whether or not the author believes in a personal Adam, or how he would expound the Pauline parallelism between Adam and Christ in Rom. v, 12, 25. On the geological proofs of the antiquity of man he gives a confused dissertation, bringing out no clear conclusion. He makes no allusion to the ascertained lateness of the glacial break-up, and the consequent "pluvial period" hastening the geological events. We have sometimes suspected that Yale was infected by the malaria proceeding from a certain Marsh. Our author seems to entertain no predilection for Darwinism.

The prophets, he thinks, were more largely preachers than predicters. Their predictions were not always fulfilled, and he even gives a list of mistaken prophecies. Their fulfillments in Christ are generally secondary, and even the celebrated Isa. liii, originally fulfilled in other personages, and is applied to Christ only by accommodation. Yet there is an organic connection between the prophetic system and Christ. The old dispensation is truly a preparatory to the new, and this new is found to authenticate the second-hand lapping over of the residuum of a once-fulfilled prediction upon the person of Christ.

But the "higher criticism," specially attracts our attention by its heroic treatment of the Pentateuch or, including Joshua, Hexateuch. The "tradition" of the Jewish Church regarding its own literature is nullified and ignored at start. The Hexateuch is seen to be "a composite book," made of crudely juxtaposed scraps and laws of obviously different ages of history. Critical elimination of conglomerated parts discloses indeed a *Grundschrift*, a *ground-script* or *basal document* at the core, which, however, is none the more true for being basal. Dr. Ladd gives us the *ground-scripts* of several leading investigators for

each book of the Hexateuch. On these primitive skeletons Dr. Ladd remarks, in reference to his critics:

> Fault will doubtless be found with the author for going even thus far in affirming the results of critical research. Some students would much prefer the statement that criticism has failed hitherto to reach any conclusions as to the composition of the Hexateuch; others would force the re-affirmation of the tradition of the synagogue; still others would desire the full and unquestioning assertion of all the details of the theories of Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen. But we stand upon the facts. Certain general conclusions wholly adverse to the traditional view are as well established as any critical results can be. It is simple statement of fact to say that in Germany—so far as we are aware—Keil remains the only advocate of a view at all resembling the traditional one. Even Delitzsch—so far as can be judged from his statements, which are always commendably cautious, but often obscure and wavering—could be claimed in support of most of our very moderate conclusions.

Assuming the validity of a division into Elohistic and Jehovistic documents, the great question with "the advanced criticism" is, "since the Jehovist is generally agreed to have written in the time, from 700 B. C. to 900 B. C., and the Deuteronomist not long previous to 621—did the Elohist write before 900, or after 600?"

Now be it understood that Dr. Ladd does not fully affirm these "advanced" views. He thinks it is a matter of degrees; modification and additions have taken place to an unknown extent; but the sweeping extremism of German "criticism" is untenable. First giving a calm statement of the "critical" theory, he next arrays a series of formidable objections and takes position in *via media*. The several points against the theory he makes are: (1) Its discordance with the facts of Ezra, and his period; (2) With the plain truth of an antiquity of the religion earlier than Prophetism and clearly originating in the Mosaic age; (3) With the high and commanding personality of Moses; (4) With the traits of antiquity in some of the so-called Mosaic laws; (5) With the traditional antiquity of hereditary feasts and other institutes, such as the Passover, Sanctification of the First-born, Offerings and Sacrifices, the Tabernacle, the Priesthood, all pointing to a certain primitive national origin, authenticating their history, and by their history authenticated.

The questions herein involved Dr. Ladd conceives to require for authoritative decision a life-long study by profound experts. Especially do the philological aspects of the discussion require further exploration by our Oriental scholars. The following paragraph shows this point in a strong light.

> But what is the precise truth as to the grammar and etymology of the author of the Grundschrift? This question is still in dispute. The means for making the necessary comparisons are few; and all our conclusions may be largely vitiated

by our ignorance as to how we shall distinguish between writings which are in a body of late date, and early writings into which certain words and phrases of late form have been introduced at a late date. Delitzsch is doubtless right in denying the correctness of many of the earlier statements of Graf, Popper, and Kuenen. But his own positive affirmation—"The so-called Elohistic language is ancient throughout: . . . there is no trace of the peculiar exilic forms and syntax"—is at best very doubtful. The thorough examination of Ryssel led him to the following conclusions. The language of the Elohistic portions of the Pentateuch would assign them, so far as its Aramaizing is concerned, to the second period of the language, viz., that between Josiah and 536 B. C. It is conceded by Ryssel, however, that certain parts of Numbers, in themselves considered, should be referred to the time of the later books of the Old Testament. But many of the conclusions of this author have been most seriously shaken by the searching criticism and independent research of Giesebrecht. According to this critic a large proportion of the words and roots distinctive of the Elohist can be shown to be either Aramaic or Aramaizing.

Dr. Ladd concludes that, as yet, "there is no reason to depart from the most general conclusions" of Delitzsch, if we make all allowance for successive redactions. And he still believes that "the principal part of the Elohist," (to which the first chapter of Genesis belongs) "the superior laws and histories, belong to the earliest age of the language." It will be seen, therefore, that Dr. Ladd does not quite belong to the Kuenen or even Robertson Smith sections of "criticism."

The unanimity of German criticism is by no means conclusive to the English and American mind. We remember the period when Hegelism was so supreme that none was so bold as to give it denial, and how soon the period of its fall when "none so poor as to do it reverence." Let the English and American mind, taking all the materials that Germany can furnish, revise the logic and draw the independent conclusion. We have no fears of the result.

Biblical Study, its Principles, Methods and History, together with a Catalogue of Reference. By CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., Davenport Professor of Hebrew and Cognate Languages in Union Theological Seminary, N. Y. 12mo, pp. 506. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883. Price, $2 50.

Dr. Briggs is a clear thinker and a fine writer. He has here collected a series of his fugitive articles on Biblical topics, forming a somewhat connected train of thought, and treating on questions lately discussed. He occupies nearly similar grounds with Professor Ladd. The doctrine that *inspired Scripture evidences itself directly to the soul* has a fine evangelical ring, but it means that our canon has an "inner" and outer Bible distinguishing themselves to our subjectivity. Those who cannot undertake Dr. Ladd may, perhaps, satisfy themselves with Dr. Briggs.

Bible Hermeneutics. A Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. By MILTON S. TERRY, S.T.D. 8vo, pp. 781. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. Price, $4.

Dr. Terry's new volume is one of the most elaborate and able works ever issued from our press. It is written in clear, manly English, and embodies a vast compass of erudition and thought. Of course we do not pledge ourselves to agree with him in all his positions. But we can only announce his work in our present number, with a hope of a fuller notice in a subsequent Quarterly.

Theological.

An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. By GILBERT, Bishop of Sarum. With an Appendix, containing the Augsburg Confession, Creed of Pope Pius IV., etc. Revised and Corrected; with copious Notes and additional References. By Rev. JAMES R. PAGE, A.M., of Queen's College, Cambridge, Minister of Carlisle Chapel, Lambeth. 8vo, pp. 585. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1842.

There are two books of fine old English theology well worthy the attention of the Methodist theological thinker: "Pearson on the Creed," from whom Watson culls many a fine extract, and "Burnet on the Thirty-nine Articles," which sheds much light upon our own standard document. The former is a true specimen of the free, fresh English of his age; the latter is less lucid and classic, yet abounds in vigorous and suggestive discussions. When, in the reign of James I., the debates aroused by Arminius in Holland had powerfully impressed the English mind, the best thinkers in England were awakened to find how completely they were fettered in their articles by the imported theology of Geneva. The still older Eastern, Greek, or Chrysostomian, theology had been supplanted by the later Western, or Augustinian, dogmas. They had not strength enough to reconstruct the Articles, and so the Chrysostomians, or Arminians, re-interpreted them. The various parties were so equally divided that a compromise spontaneously took place, by which, under the generic Calvinistic phrases, different specific meanings might be allowed. The clergy generally went back to the Greek theology, and this, in fact, drew them nearer to that of Trent, and the fashionable and court opinions became anti-Calvinistic. The result was, as somewhat overstated for terseness' sake, by Lord Chatham, that the English Church has "a popish Liturgy, a Calvinistic Creed, and an Arminian Clergy." The

Puritans adhered to high Calvinism, so that the curious antithesis, remarked by Selden in his "Table Talk," existed by which absolutists in creed became the liberalists in politics, and *vice versa*. But so severely did the Puritan absolutistic liberalism press upon the nation that the reaction brought in Charles II. with a national debauch. The Revolution of 1688 restored the public balance. And here it is, in the time of William and Mary, that Burnet comes in with his "Exposition" of the Churchly Articles. He writes with great good sense and piety; with an unpolished and often intricate vigor of style and thought; and with an irenical spirit quite well worth our study at the present day. The Calvinists and Lutherans and Arminians were all in a quarrelsome mood; and he brings them counsels of peace and love; yet not without a free fraternal discussion of doctrinal truth. In much of his treatment he gives the various views of leading minds and classes of minds, with but gentle interposition of his own opinions. Upon the Predestinarian article, especially, he congratulates himself upon having stated the argument on both sides so fairly that nobody could tell on which side he stood, although he really held the Eastern, or Arminian, theology. Dean Stanley wishes that some one would explain historically how John Wesley became a maintainer of the Eastern theology. We understand it to have been as to Predestination the theology of the whole Wesley family, derived from its High-Church antecedents.

The clergy were required, so Burnet says, to declare their belief *ex animo* in the entire truth of the Articles. Yet, to give a due freedom of opinion, they were allowed to read any opinion into the Articles which did not violate either the lexical meaning of the words or the grammatical syntax of the sentences. Thus there may be "an Article conceived in such general words that it can admit of different literal and grammatical senses, even when the senses are plainly contrary one to another; yet both may subscribe the Article with a good conscience, and without any equivocation." Thus, for instance, the Article concerning Christ's *descent into Hell* admits of three different, yet allowable, interpretations. The Ninth Article admits as many.

Instead of modifying the Articles by diverse interpretations, Wesley, in his day, expurgated the Articles themselves. One of our Roman Catholic exchanges lately impeached the integrity of Wesley for mutilating Articles he had sworn to maintain. But Wesley made no change which altered the doctrines as then

held by the Church authorities, and as by him promised to be taught. All he did was to diminish the amount of the assent required by those who belonged to his "Societies." And as American Methodism, in ceasing to be "Societies," and becoming a Church, adopted his diminished form, so, what he struck out from the Ninth Article is not to be required as Methodist doctrine; nay, it stands in the historical position of being, like the Nineteenth (predestinarian) Article, positively exscinded and supposably denied.

On the Ninth Article, which we have had late occasions to discuss, Burnet gives the various existing opinions, condemning some and legitimating others, but very usually balancing between. He fully maintains the doctrine of hereditary sinwardness derived from the Fall, condemning the Pelagians, who hold that every man is freshly born pure as Adam, and able to please God without the Spirit's aid. He repudiates the Manicheans, who explained depravity as the work of an evil anti-God. And, what is to our purpose, he finds the transmission of sinwardness from Adam to take place by the law of propagation. "God has settled it by a law of creation" that a soul should be adjusted to a fitting body. "And if with this [law] God made another general law, that when all things were duly prepared for the propagation of the species of mankind, a soul should always be ready to go into and animate those first threads and beginnings of life; those laws being laid down, Adam, by corrupting his own frame, corrupted the frame of his own posterity, by the general course of things and the great law of the creation. So that the suffering this to run through all the race is no more (only different in degrees and extent) than the suffering the folly or madness of a man to infect his posterity. In these things God acts as the Creator of the world by general rules, and these must not be altered because of the sins and disorders of men; but they are rather to have their course, that so sin may be its own punishment."

And then he raises the perennial question: Is this hereditary *sinwardness* truly sin? that is, is it responsible sin, "*hereditary guilt?*" "The defilement of the race being thus stated," he says, "a question remains whether this can be called a sin, and such as deserves *God's wrath and damnation?*" To this question at the present day, we understand some Arminians to say, Yes; but we understand a greater number, with Dr. Wilbur Fisk, to say *No;* and to that *No* categorical we give our humble ditto. Hereditary sinwardness, inborn tendency to

sin, is not itself sin, that is, "guilt," until we make it so by free, volitional action. And Burnet goes on thus: "An opposition of nature to the divine nature must certainly be hateful to God, as it is the *root* of much malignity and sin. Such a nature cannot be the object of his love, and of itself cannot be accepted of God." This is precisely our position as explained in our last Quarterly, and (although we had not then read Burnet on the Article) in remarkably similar phrase. We said that an inborn sinwardness was a nature "contrarious to the divine nature," and so the proper object of a real, though not judicial or punitive, displacency. It is this non-judicial, non-punitive character that, in the next sentence, Burnet misses and (contradictorily to himself, as we shall soon show) runs widely astray, followed by some of our theologians. Burnet adds: "Now, since there is no mean in God, between *love* and *wrath*, *acceptation* and *damnation*, if such persons are not in the first order [namely, of love and acceptation] they must be in the second." Now, according to Burnet's own repeated assertion of the requisiteness of freedom for responsibility, there is between God's "love and acceptation" of a freely-obedient being and his "wrath and damnation" of a freely-disobedient, at least one intermediate; namely, his displacency toward a necessitatedly evil being. And we may add a second, namely, God's divine complacency for a necessitatedly pure and benevolent angel. Of Burnet's affirmations of the requisiteness of freedom for responsibility and judicial condemnation the following is a specimen: "It is a principle that seems to arise out of the light of nature, that no man is accountable, rewardable, or punishable, but for that in which he acts freely, without force or compulsion; and, so far, all are agreed." But how does a "man" "act freely," without force or compulsion," in being born a sinward being? And how can God hold such being amenable to wrath and damnation for so being born?

This question, whether inborn sinwardness deserves God's "wrath and damnation," Burnet discusses, giving the opposite views and arguments, but very indecisively indicating his own. He gives the Augustinian interpretation of Rom. v, 12–21, and concludes: "This explication does certainly quadrate more to the words of the Article, as it is known that this was the tenet of those who prepared the Articles, it having been the generally received opinion from St. Austin's [St. Augustine's] days downward." And that means that the Article was, originally and historically, Calvinistic in its meaning. He then gives the methods

of the Arminians of his day to read a different sense into the words, methods so poor as to be hardly worth the giving. One method was to say that this passage of Paul stood alone, and we lack the confirmatory force of similar passages, and are, therefore, not so sure of the meaning of this. The other was to say that, in recognizing the "condemnation" of this passage, Paul simply assumed the truth of the prevalent opinion of the Jews of the day, in order to illustrate or enforce the doctrine of redemption through Christ. That is, it was a case of accommodation: proving a truth from popular concession; the conclusion being true, the argument was untrue. How terribly a Wesley was needed to sweep the clause with a besom!

That between the divine "love and acceptation" of justified man and the "wrath and damnation" of a freely sinning unholy being there is a "mean," namely, the divine unjudicial displacency toward an evil, unfree agent, we maintained in our last Quarterly. Two learned friends, the one in the North and the other in the South, have written us objections to the reality of this intermediate. As it happens, both these respected correspondents express a high valuation of our work on the Will, a work which, for some twenty years, has been recommended to be read in our Course of Study. Our two friends, nevertheless, seem totally unaware that whole chapters of that volume are expended in elucidating that *intermediate*. In our two chapters entitled "Distinction between Automatic Excellence and Moral Desert," and "Created Moral Desert Impossible," (pp. 375–396,) we have discussed this subject with a fullness and, as we think, with a demonstrative conclusiveness which admits of no valid reply, and which ought to have expelled the fatalistic monster of "hereditary guilt" from our theology.

It was a full decade since we had read these two chapters; but we see nothing, save some little stiffnesses, occasionally, of expression, in which we could now improve them. To save the trouble of our readers in referring to the volume, and ourself from rewriting, we here quote a few passages, at the same time asking our friends who are disposed to differ from our view to fully read both chapters.

We quote the following on

Non-meritorious Necessitated Holiness.

If God were to create a being of perceptions, emotions, and volitions, all perfectly excellent and well adjusted, yet all necessary and automatic in their action, so that every volition, like the pointers of a perfectly true clock, should point exactly right, such a being would be innocent and lovely, and in that sense of

lovely innocence it might be called *holy*. It could not be punishable. We should æsthetically admire it; we should sympathetically love it; we should wish it happy in a condition accordant to its nature. Yet we should none the less hold it incapable of moral responsibility, moral merit or demerit, moral good or evil desert, moral reward or penalty. Nor could it, even by Omnipotence itself, be invested with a morally meritorious holiness. All its *holiness* would be simply a lovely and excellent automatic innocence or purity. The sum of all this is, that *a necessitated holiness is no meritorious or morally deserving holiness*.—P. 383.

Non-responsible Automatic Badness.

Again, should God create an automatic fiend: a being whose perceptions were, indeed, true, but whose emotions were purely and with a perfect intensity, yet automatically, malignant; and whose volitions were, with all their strength, automatically bad; we should hate such a being and wish it out of our way. We might still admire its vicious perfection. Yet, when we had indulged our abhorrence of it, and come to remember coolly its automatism, we should see that, though bad, it was umblamably bad. Its volitions, being as necessitated, are as irresponsible as the springs of a gun-lock. Upon such a fiend, if the infliction of *pain* would set his volitions right, and make all his movements safe and beneficial, we should, for the common good, think expedient to inflict it, simply as an alterative; just as we would insert a key and turn it round to set any other machinery right—simply as an alterative. Such infliction of pain could not be a punishment, in the sense of justice, or execution for a responsible crime. It would simply be an expedient, like a medicine or a mechanical adjustment, in which there can be no moral element. We might, for the good of the world, wish such a being destroyed; not as a moral retribution to him, but for the common weal, and, if possible, painlessly. The sum of all which is, *a necessitated depravity is no responsible or justly punishable depravity*. As there is, therefore, what may be called a *holiness* without any meritoriousness or moral good desert, so there is what may be called a *depravity*, or a *sin*, without any responsibility or morally penal desert.—Pp. 383, 384.

Irresponsible Congenital Depravity of our Fallen Race.

The whole human race, viewed as fallen in Adam, and apart from redemption through Christ, is thus necessitatedly unholy. It is in disconformity with the ideal prescribed by the divine law. Judged by the standard of the moral law, it is evil; and, in the sense above defined, it is morally evil. But it is not *responsibly* evil. It cannot be retributively, and in the strict sense of the word, *punished*. Incapable it is, indeed, of the holiness, and so of the happiness, of heaven. It rests under the displacency of heaven as not being holy in the sense of conformed to his law, which is but the transcript of his own character and the expression of his own divine feelings.—P. 385.

One of our correspondents above mentioned assured us that Dr. Bledsoe would have condemned our notion of a *created unholiness* as an absurdity. We assured him that we were perfectly aware of it, and referred him to the following paragraphs:

Created Moral Desert, Hereditary Guilt, or Punishability, Impossible.

The maxim laid down by Mr. Bledsoe in his Theodicy, and used by him with great argumentative effect, that *there can be no created virtue or viciousness*, ought, according to the doctrine of our last chapter, to read, *there can be no created moral desert, good or evil*, and so corrected it would lose none of the argumentative efficiency with which his handling invests it. There can be a created conformity or disconformity to the divine law; but no created merit or demerit therein or therefor, or desert of reward or penalty.

The righteous law, let us say, has a twofold office, namely, the judicatory or

critical, and the retributive or *penal*. In its former character it is an ethical ideal by which is tested the active real; it is the rule by which the ethical character of its subjects is admeasured. That subject, if automatic, if created and having moral status anterior to free volitional action, is still tested by the law's ideal, is commeasured by the perfect rule; but there the office of the law stops. The instant it should proceed to use its retributive function and inflict penalty, it would be by its own rectitude condemned. But the moment free volitional moral action commences, the result is accountability; and retributive righteousness or unrighteousness inhere to his personality and being.

It might be said, then, that if the agent is not free, the law has nothing to do with him, inasmuch as he lacks the qualification of the subject of the law. And we might grant that the law scarcely is his judge; but only an instrument, as an ethical critique, to estimate the quality of the agent necessitated as good or bad without responsibility. Yet when the agent is placed, like Adam, at the historical commencement of a legal governmental system, the law is installed already over him, and it is its office to pronounce, even if it pronounce that it has no jurisdiction, and that he cannot come into court. In such case the agent is necessarily placed in some relation to the law, and the law pronouncing must, as we conceive, pronounce him ethically, but not retributively, holy.—Pp. 389, 390.

We take it that these paragraphs substantiate our statement that, in spite of Burnet, there is a "mean" between God's "love" for the regenerate and his "wrath and damnation" of the sinner, namely, his unjudicial displacency toward an evil non-free agent. And that being the original case of Adam, we know precisely what is the divine "condemnation" pronounced in Scripture upon the race viewed as born sinward beings. The nature of that "condemnation" was expressed in our note on Rom. v, 18: "The condemnation would have produced the exclusion of the race from existence by the infliction of immediate death upon Adam." And we discussed the point more explicitly on Rom. xi, 32. It was a "condemnation" of the fallen race to non-existence as unfit for a probationary being without a special provision in its behalf. Like the marred vessel of the potter, though irresponsibly, it was unsuitable for the purposes of its creation. But it may be asked, however, Do you really suppose that was Paul's real meaning in Rom. v, 18? Paul, we reply, does not stop explicitly to define, or perhaps even to think out, the exact extent or limits of that "condemnation;" and so here the extent of its meaning must be limited by a just common sense and the clear nature of things, yet not transgressing the lexical boundary lines of the term. We do not pretend to know whether Paul personally realized the exact psychological import of his profound words or not; but we are absolutely sure that the mind of the omniscient Spirit that inspired Paul did. We do not suppose that Moses personally understood the true cosmogony now disclosed by science, but the Inspirer of the first chapter of Genesis did. Modern science could, doubtless, ask Moses questions about his cosmogony which

he could not answer. And so modern psychology and ethics might ask Paul questions about the bottomless import of his words to which he would decline to respond. But this we do know, the Spirit of Righteousness never inspired Paul to say that God damned the unborn soul for "hereditary guilt," and we do not believe that Paul ever said it.

The Conflict of Centuries. By C. W. MILLER, D.D. 12mo, pp. 308. Southern Methodist Publishing House, Nashville, Tenn. 1883. 2

Dr. Miller's book is a very interesting tractate for the hour. It is called forth by discussions that have been in progress in our Southern States and in the Dominion, as well as editorially in our Quarterly. It is a resurvey of the doctrines of Sin and Responsibility. It especially seeks an answer to the question: In what condition does Christ's redemption find our fallen race? What is our fallen condition before Christ interposes? Augustinianism answers that it is (according to the antithetic passage of Paul in Rom. v, 12) a state of genetic unconditional reprobation to an eternal hell. What is the answer of Arminianism? Dr. Miller traces the history of the "conflict" through the "centuries" rapidly, clearly, and quite conclusively.

The early or oriental Christian Church of the first three centuries emphasized the doctrine of human freedom as the basis of responsibility, and found human nature sinwardly disposed, but laid little stress on the derivation of that sinwardness from Adam. But when, about A. D. 415, Pelagius so emphasized the doctrine of freedom as to ignore the need of the Divine Spirit, Augustine came forth with his absolutism. He maintained that somehow the race so inherited the guilt of Adam as to be in a state of just eternal wrath and damnation from God. In that state redemption finds us, and elects from a sovereign good pleasure just such as it wills, with nothing in the creature moving thereto. Dr. Miller finds that it was Cassian that in this age furnished the true Arminian answer. The great abilities of Augustine secured the triumph of his theory, and it reigned, at least nominally, in the Western Church through the Middle Ages, and until the Reformation. And it largely rules still, and, to some extent, even among Arminian communions.

At the Reformation Augustinianism received an emphatic re-enforcement among the Protestant Churches. Luther and Calvin, more Augustinian than Augustine himself, led the way.

And, what is here specially important, it took full possession of the English Church. Dr. Miller quotes Hagenbach as saying: "The theological professors at Cambridge and Oxford were Calvinistic for fifty years from Elizabeth's accession. Bucer and Peter Martyr were called by Cranmer to the chair of divinity in Cambridge and Oxford during the reign of Edward. Cranmer, too, in 1552, invited Calvin, Bullinger, and Melanchthon to England to aid in drawing up a confession of faith for the Protestant Churches."—P. 93. Thus the Thirty-nine Articles were, unquestionably, a Calvinistic document. And what greatly aggravates the matter is, that the pestiferous technics of Augustinianism, such as "original sin" and "total depravity," became imbedded even in the Arminian vocabulary.

And this brings us to the age of JAMES ARMINIUS. Dr. Miller briefly gives his history, with extracts from his works, indicating his rejection of genetic unconditional reprobation of the race by the Fall. But, as Dr. Miller correctly says, it was Philip Limborch who was the truest systemizer of the Arminian theology. He gives us an admirable summary of Limborch's views, well worth our readers' study. How the doctrines of the Hollandic Arminians supplanted Augustinianism in England we have intimated in our notice of Burnet on another page. Our author furnishes a clear survey of Wesley's change in later life from the intensely Augustinian positions of his tractate on "Original Sin," and his deliberate purpose in striking genetic reprobation from our Articles.

In stating the views of Fletcher, however, there seems to us an important distinction which Dr. Miller overlooks. One position, as taken by Limborch, by our Wesleyan Articles, and by our own editorials, is this: Our state, previous to the interposition of the Redemption, was simply prospective non-existence (of a sinward but guiltless race) by the infliction of death on Adam. The other is, that our state was a just desert of an eternal hell. Now, which does Fletcher take? As we judge him from his words, so far as given by our author, he took the latter. He was that much Augustinian. The work of Christ, as he seems to state it, was a gracious rescue of the race from *a just desert of hell*, and the placing us upon a new probation. Fletcher, for instance, puts the question, "How could God damn, to all eternity, any of Adam's children for a sin which Christ expiated?" Christ's expiation, then, saves the race from a just eternal damnation for Adam's sin.

We have agreed wonderfully well with Dr. Miller, and we heartily recommend the perusal of his work to all our readers; but there is one point upon which he opens upon us a very vigorous, but quite superfluous, onslaught. He quotes a passage from our work on the Will, in which we state that a malignant non-free agent is "evil, morally evil," yet not responsible. This he earnestly pronounces a "self-destructive contradiction," etc. All this excitement arises from the fact that Dr. Miller adopts Dr. Bledsoe's formula (specified in one of our extracts given in our notice of Burnet) that there cannot be a created or necessitated holiness, unholiness, or moral character. On the contrary, as before stated, our formula is, that there can be created and necessitated holiness, unholiness, and moral character, but that such cannot be meritorious or responsible. Especially if, as we show in one of these extracts, the unfree agent is divinely placed under the cognizance of the moral law, then must his rightward or wrongward character and conduct be critically and morally adjudged. The very vessels of the sanctuary were pronounced "holy," though not responsibly so. Animals were held morally unclean, yet not retributively so. And when we speak of created unholiness, we have exemplified it in the case of Adam as a disconformity to a divinely applied law. If Dr. Miller thinks our above "automatic fiend" is not evil or hateful, any more than a pure automatic living angel, he is perfectly welcome to that view. We prefer to say that one is "good," and the other "evil;" and, when brought under authoritative scrutiny of the moral law, morally good or evil, but not responsibly or retributively so. If that be to him, as he says, "unthinkable," we imagine that very few of our readers will share his professed incapacity of thought.

Dr. Miller furnishes us an argument against infant regeneration which seems to us to be too unqualified.

First, he attacks the Calvinistic doctrine which affirms, as he interprets, that regeneration is partial, and not entire. It maintains that a degree of "concupiscence" remains in the regenerate, and that Dr. Miller earnestly denies. Now, if by "concupiscence" is meant our physiological and psychological sensitivities, by which we are susceptible to temptation and very liable to sin, so that the regenerate often do sin, the Calvinists are correct. No constituent part of our psychological or physical constitution is cast out or, in substance, changed in regeneration. It is the vitalizing influence, presence, and power of the Holy Spirit, obeyed and acted by our free agency, that constitutes our regeneration.

Nor does the still-remaining presence of the above-named susceptibilities and liabilities to sin in the least contradict the doctrine that our regeneration is of the whole man. The regenerative Spirit does pervade body, soul, and spirit. But here is a momentous distinction that, we think, Dr. Miller overlooks, namely, the distinction between the *extent* of the Spirit's presence and the intensity of its presence and power. This is the distinction sometimes philosophically found between *extension* and *intension*. We tolerate the phrase "total depravity," because that depravity truly does pervade the *total* man; not because its degree and intensity in the whole man is total, so total that he is as bad as the devil; bad as he can be; so bad that the most abandoned mature pirate is no more depraved than a modest young girl. *Totus vir depravatus*, not *totus vir depravatus totaliter*. And so the regenerate spirit is entire in its *extent* through the whole man, but measured in its intensity of influence and power; so that the free will is able to yield to temptation. According to the fullness of the presence and influence of the Spirit obeyed by the man is his degree of spiritual power; that is, the entirety of his sanctification. When that Spirit's power and the man's concurrence are so entire that the man is able to, and actually does, reject *all* sin, and so does remain in the undiminished fullness of the divine approbation, unquestionably he is entirely sanctified. The love of God is in his heart, and his path is the path of the just shining to the perfect day. And this is the simple account of the difference between regeneration and entire sanctification, at which so many minds are perplexed.

Now the fact that the word *regeneration* is usually applied only to the adult, arises from the other fact that the adult is the personality usually dealt with in urging regeneration. And we by no means insist that the *term* should be applied to infants. But that the infant, being by the vitalizing Spirit a child of God, is, as an infant, in the same state essentially as justifying faith has brought the adult, is to us perfectly clear. Here we think we accord with Dr. Miller. He even quotes approvingly our words: "The infant is in the kingdom of God with a character perhaps corresponding to regeneration in the adult."— *Will*, p. 347. But his specialty is, that he requires the *act* of regeneration to be preceded by a state of spiritual death. But we may consider that the gift of personal life and that of spiritual life by the Spirit may both be so bestowed upon the infant that generation and regeneration are simultaneous. Each is preceded by its non-living state.

Outlines of the Doctrine of the Resurrection, Biblical, Historical, and Scientific. By Rev. R. J. COOKE, M.A. With an Introduction by D. D. WHEDON, LL.D. 12mo, pp. 407. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1883.

NOT a few thinkers at the present day identify death and resurrection with the successional waste and repair of our bodies by which our corporeal life is perpetuated. Particles in infinitesimal detail are displaced and replaced by their minute successors, until an entire change is made, and yet the organism is historically kept going, and is called *the same.* And hence it was lately said, in a theological journal, that there need not be a particle of the dying body in the body of the resurrection. But all that is confounding facts of very different nature. That great break-up of the body at death, specially appointed by divine authority, by which all corporeal continuity is destroyed, is no way analogous to that stream of molecular conduction by which corporeal continuity has been preserved. The two facts are, indeed, in momentous contrast. The one is the assimilative work of the present and active life-power, transmitting its vitalizing and organizing energies by physical contact from particle to particle; the latter is the catastrophe of the sudden withdrawal of the entire life-power, and abandonment of the organism to total disintegration and individualization of ultimate particles. Now, in order to a *continuity* which can constitute a resurrection of the *same body*, the life-power must go back to that aggregate of particles, and reorganize them into a new corporeity. It must go, like a divine voice, to the "graves;" it must waken the truly "dead;" it must quicken the "mortal bodies;" in short, it must effect a renewed continuity of the once living and dying body. This is altogether a different process from a construction from a new material—a creation. Every so-called "theory of the resurrection" which denies this molecular identity involves a misnomer; being truly a "theory" opposed to the "resurrection," and a denial of its reality. This book delineates not "a theory of the resurrection," but the resurrection itself.

Mr. Cooke, in the present volume, demonstrates this molecular identity to be the doctrine of the Word of God, of the Church of God, and even of Ethnic sacred tradition. He ranges through the Old Testament and the New, and finds it there. He appeals to the earliest post-apostolic fathers, to the catacombs, to the creeds, to the great doctors of the Middle Ages, to the symbols of the Reformation, and the Articles of Faith of the Evangelical Churches of Europe and America, and all pro-

nounce a unanimous verdict. And, then, since science is claimed as denying molecular identity, to science will he appeal. And, so far from opposition there, he finds that in fact he can draw from science the most striking confirmatory analogy and beautifying illustration. It is the first brilliant *brochure* of a young author, and, so far as we know, the completest treatise in our language on the subject. It is a "live" book; perhaps too exuberant with the florid life and free diffuseness of an habitual popular speaker. To some subordinate points we might dissent, as Mr. Cooke is withal an independent thinker; but his volume may, we think, aspire to a standard position on its subject.

Contrary Winds, and other Sermons. By WILLIAM M. TAYLOR, D.D., LL.D., Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. Crown 8vo, pp. 372. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price, $1 75.

These twenty-four sermons, "printed now as they were preached at first to the writer's congregation," are an acceptable addition to the practical religious literature of the times. Without being profound they impress one as the product of a strong, cultivated mind. They are not speculative, but eminently practical, dealing with the problems of every-day life in treating which they make their appeal to Holy Scripture, to conscience, and to an enlightened common-sense. They are ethical rather than spiritual; not decidedly emotional, yet their thoughts are enlivened by a calm undercurrent of religious feeling. In style they are plain and direct, sufficiently rhetorical and illustrative, and invigorated by that inspiration which is the outcome of a high purpose. In doctrine they are in the main eminently scriptural, albeit, in the discourse on the "Seal and Earnest of the Spirit," the writer falls into the error of confounding the *direct* with the *indirect* witness of the Spirit. A little more Wesleyan and Pauline theology infused into that sermon would add much to its value.

The Living Christ: The Life and the Light of Men. By the Rev. W. P. HARRISON, D.D., Book Editor of the M. E. Church, South. 12mo., pp. 297. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Methodist Publishing House. 1883. Price, $1.

Dr. Harrison, as is well known, is an eminent scholar, and wields an able pen. The present volume pictures Christ as the presiding patron of our world, ever present and ever benign. He is described as the Christ of yesterday through the Old Testament ages until the epoch of Calvary, and as the Christ of to-day from John the Baptist to our present hour. A tinge of attractive

mysticism pervades the whole. But the author by no means shuns the probing of deep theological problems. His view of the atonement is somewhat original. Christian thinkers will find a rich reward in the study of this thoughtful volume.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

World-Life; or, Comparative Geology. By ALEXANDER WINCHELL, LL.D., Professor of Geology and Paleontology in the University of Michigan. 12mo, pp. 642. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1883.

What is the best theory that the Science of our day can frame of the origin, structure, and destiny of the Material Universe as a Whole? This is the large question, very large, which Dr. Winchell aims to answer in this new volume. Worlds and universes have been built by theoretic thinkers, in chronological succession, during the past ages of active thought. They have been largely of an *a priori* character, yet gradually modified to truth by the advance of science. And now, at this day, so great a mass of scientific material has been piled up by the illustrious sons of Science, that our author takes his stand upon it as a high pedestal, and throws out his bold conjectures, in lines of logical probability, so grandly as to sketch the rational outlines of a Whole. He can tell us with a certainty, not wholly absolute, yet furnishing a reliable repose for our faith, what the substance, the growth, the history, the decline, the death—without a resurrection?—of the stupendous but not infinite Pan.

The volume is symmetrically divided into Four Parts; the Fourth being a history of cosmogonic thought from the days of the Greek philosophers to the age of Laplace. The three Scientific Parts treat of WORLD-STUFF, or the primal matter out of which the worlds are made; PLANETOLOGY, or the formation of planets according to the Nebular Theory, which the author very ably and perhaps conclusively explains and defends; GENERAL COSMOGONY, in which, after having in the previous part learned how a planet comes to form, we are enabled to take an inclusive survey of the entire congregation of worlds, filling a vast yet limited space in a limitless immensity.

It is, we may say, in a special sense, a *serious* subject. In spite of the deep interest we feel in *knowing*, yet, bare of all living beings, the material universe, with all the sublime vastness of its magnitudes, movements, and spaces, is a bleak machine.

Fires and blazes and heats enough it has; but they are not of the sort to warm the heart. And the fact that there hangs over the whole a destiny of final deadlock, that all its movements are but "funeral marches to the grave," sheds over the whole an aspect of disaster and doom, without the dignity and human interest of the tragic. It is simply a vast machine coming to a general hitch from which there is no known extrication. All its parts remain; but with so perfect a countercheck that not a particle can move. Not a pulse can beat, not a breath can heave. It still encumbers space, but as a worthless hulk! Büchner, the frank atheist, leaves it there through all the eternities of the future, and seems to jubilate over the prospect. Spencer suggests a hope of revival on his theory of pulsation and remission. Dr. Winchell, who claims to be the first announcer of this sad finality, even earlier than Spencer, has a resource in Theism; but does not tell us the process by which Theos restores the dominion of motion and inaugurates the new *αἰών*. Even our theology and our religion shudder over this catastrophe, and our spirits wonder what is to become of us ensconced in the solid bulk of this universal iceberg. And yet, somehow, our little Greek Testament seems to anticipate such remissions and pulsations when it talks of divine existence and even human penalty as enduring *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*. And, truly, what danger to the body of the resurrection from any material evolutions? Spirit-ruled, and able to rule its own corporeity, it stands unharmed amid "the crash of matter and the wreck of worlds." Perfect master of its own sensations it refuses to suffer any pain from heat or cold; perfect master of its own molecular organism it repels or evades all danger from collision. "The mind," says Milton, "in its own place and of itself can make a hell of heaven, a heaven of hell."

The World-Stuff, or substance out of which our system is made, is found by our author in various degrees of aggregation, as meteors, comets, and nebulæ, and the problem is first to show how these are modeled into planetary forms. This leads to a discussion of the primordial nature of the world-stuff, and the theory dawns into view that the some sixty so-called elements of matter are in simplest state a primitive *one*,—"a semi-spiritual ether." All material things are then but the foldings and combinations of this primordium. "As a vesture shalt thou fold them and they shall be folded." In the Second Part we have a full discussion and maintenance of the Nebular Theory and the

formation of planets and solar system on that hypothesis. He embraces that view under the conviction that it requires more credulity to reject than to accept it. Our planets and their sun are specimens of the entire plan of the universe.

The Comparative Geology of the Planets, like the parallel columns of a Polyglot, present but a varied repetition of the same story. Beginning with a "fire-mist," which (the apparent solecism is the author's) is "cold" and "dark," there are, successively, conflagation by condensation, a surface crust from surface cooling, a temperate inhabitable period, a refrigeration, and final frozen stereotype. Our moon has gone through this process; and our earth may look upon the dead lunar surface as a middle-aged gentleman gazes upon the pale, cold face of a dead baby and reads the image of his own destiny. And here Dr. Winchell, with a human and Christian interest, raises and discusses the question, whether the sister worlds of astronomy are inhabited? Shelley, the poet, once said, that astronomy amply refutes the notion of God's begetting a son from a Jewish maiden. The greatest of Chalmers's productions was his Astronomical Sermons, preached to reconcile the vastness of the universe with the incarnation and the atonement. Whewell, on the other hand, undertook to solve the theological problem by denying the population of any world but ours. But modern theology prefers to believe in a vast Republic of living worlds, divided into planetary provinces, with some common interest, under the Supreme Ruler. Dr. Winchell, while furnishing admirable statements of the vast variety of forms suited to a wide variety of existences on our earth, points out the non-necessity of requiring that all living, intelligent, or even responsible forms, must be conformed to the human model. He reminds us that it is simply an affair of attaching intelligence to a material form; and there is no limiting the variety of methods and forms with which that may be done. "Why might not psychic natures be enshrined in indestructible flint and platinum?" We read, a few months since, a Swedenborgian speculation that the form of a human soul was globular. And that curiously reminded us that, years ago, we had occasion to illustrate, colloquially, the difference between brute instinct and human reason, and were led to say that the former radiated from its center in a few far-reaching directions, while the latter emitted its radii equally in all directions. We thus made the human intellect a globe! How easily might there be a race of living, brilliant globes, like far-

seeing eye-balls, blazing with far-reaching intelligence, floating at their own sweet will in ether or even in pure space, unchilled by cold, unmelted by heat, and unknowing of dissolution. And then the nereids and mermaids of the mythologies tell us how easily watery Jupiter may be stocked with living beauty. And Dr. Winchell's reminder that there may be beings with more than five, six, or seven senses suggests that even the bleakest age of a planet or the moon may be truly invested with an unseen glory, and be the residence of unseen populations and "principalities and powers." Just so the white, dry, cold skeleton in the anatomical room was once clothed with beauty and occupied by intelligence. And what is this bleak machine universe but a blank skeleton? It is good for nothing, and it might just as well be so much space if it be not subservient to the existence and happiness of living beings. A living canary bird is of more value than a dead universe.

Dr. Winchell's last utterances, as here presented, on the commencement of the visible life-period on our globe, are very noteworthy. How long since the first incrustation of our globe commenced? Mivart ciphered that Darwin's Natural Selection, by his own statements, required twenty-five hundred millions of years since life first dawned on earth. Prof. Thomson disturbed our Evolution brethren profoundly by telling us it could be but fifty millions. Then it was announced as but fifteen; and then ten millions. Our author now ciphers it at *three millions!* Truly that crushes Natural Selection to nonentity. We may rest with La Conte's "paroxysmal evolution," but the paroxysms must be very spasmodic. Or if, with a late writer, we style it "saltatory evolution," evolution by jumps, it must be a very nimble jumper. On the whole we may perhaps fall back on Dawson's Creation in accordance with Evolutionary Laws. More important than even this limitation of earth's Zoic Period is the late closing of the Glacial Period, and consequent late creation of man. Four independent measurements, by American geologists, so agree as to form a medium estimate of six or seven thousand years. Does not Science begin to make her bow to Moses?

This volume is, thus far, Dr. Winchell's masterpiece. It assigns him a high rank among living scientists. Its clear exposition, in as popular style as the subject will admit, brings it within the reach of the great body of thoughtful readers. It furnishes us a magnificent survey of universal structural Cosmogony such as has not hitherto appeared.

Miscellaneous.

The Middle Kingdom. A Survey of the Geography, Government, Literature, Social Life, Arts, and History of the Chinese Empire and its Inhabitants. By S. WELLS WILLIAMS, LL.D., Professor of the Chinese Language and Literature at Yale College; author of Tonic and Syllabic Dictionaries of the Chinese Language. Revised Edition, with Illustrations, and a New Map of the Empire. In two Volumes. 8vo, pp. 836, 775. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883.

This magnificent work seems to bring China, large as life, into our office. It is too magnitudinous and too rich in its topics for a book notice, and we can now barely announce it, in expectation of a full review by an amply competent hand. It is thirty-five years since the first edition was published, and China has in that time so changed as to require, not a rewriting of the old, but a historical presentation of the new, China. It is done up—type, material, and engraving—in the best style of the Scribners.

Sketches and Anecdotes of American Methodists of the Days that Are no More. Designed for Boys and Girls. By DANIEL WISE, D.D., Author of "Heroic Methodists." "Story of a Wonderful Life," "Pleasant Pathways," etc. 16mo, pp. 352. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1883.

Dr. Wise has here gone over some of the most striking events and leading characters of our American Methodist history. Barbara Heck, Shadford, Asbury, and others in the earlier period, and M'Clintock and Wilbur Fisk in the later.

The Raven. By EDGAR ALLEN POE. Illustrated by Gustave Doré. With a Comment by Edmund C. Stedman. Magnificent folio. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1884.

"That forever adds a T to the name of Poe," we said, when, one morning long ago, the New York Tribune brought a copy of "The Raven" to our quiet Massachusetts home. We were then but slightly familiar with his name, as that, as we supposed, of one of the literary *grubs* of the New York "Grub Street." We little knew what a weird pair of wings the said grub could put on, and with what flights he could soar.

Doré has added his shadowy conceptions to those of the poet, and Stedman has prefaced it with a "Comment," tracing the genesis of the poem, yet fully appreciating its marvelous individuality. But would it not have been well if he had uttered some words unfolding the solution of Poe's parable? Of the thousands who are entranced by its rhythms and wildering fancies do a respectable minority realize the hidden meaning? What is that Raven, and what the significance of its message?

It is, we answer, our modern oracular Agnosticism, coming from the realms of outer darkness, perched upon the semblance of science and philosophy, pronouncing its eternal negative on our hopes of immortality, and leaving the soul forever prostrate under the dark shadow of Pessimism.

The Soul-Winner. A Sketch and Incidents in the Life and Labors of Edmund J. Yard, For sixty-three years a Class-Leader and Hospital Visitor in Philadelphia. By his sister, Mrs. MARY D. JAMES, with an Introduction by D. P. KIDDER, D.D. 16mo, pp. 231. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1883.

Mr. Yard was endowed by nature with a personal "magnetism," and by grace with a deep desire to draw therewith the souls of his friends to Christ. It was a blessed *charisma*. May the book spread far and wide and produce thousands of his like!

HARPER'S FRANKLIN SQUARE LIBRARY.—*David, King of Israel:* His Life and its Lessons. By the Rev. WILLIAM M. TAYLOR, D.D., Minister of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. Quarto, pp. 97. *Harry Joscelyn.* A Novel. By Mrs. OLIPHANT., Author of "For Love and Life," "The Chronicles of Carlingford," "The Curate in Charge." "The Story of Valentine and his Brother," etc., pp. 87. *Pearla;* or, The World After an Island. A Novel. By M. BETHAM EDWARDS, Author of "Kitty," "Dr. Jacob," etc., pp. 45. *By the Gate of the Sea.* A Novel. By DAVID CHRISTIE MURRAY, Author of a "Life's Atonement," "A Model Father," "Joseph's Coat," etc. pp. 116. Price, 15 cents.

The Ball of the Vegetables and other Stories in Prose and Verse. By MARGARET ETTINGE. Illustrated. Quarto, pp. 246. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The Boy Travelers in the Far East. Part Fifth. Adventures of Two Youths in a Journey Through Africa. By THOMAS KNOX, Author of "The Young Nimrods in North America," "The Young Nimrods Around the World," "Adventures of Two Youths in Journeys to Japan and China—To Siam and Java—To Ceylon and India—To Egypt and the Holy Land," etc. Illustrated. Quarto, pp. 473. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1884.

Old Mexico and Her Lost Provinces. A Journey in Mexico, Southern California, and Arizona, by way of Cuba. By WILLIAM HENRY BISHOP. Author of "Dotmold," "The House of a Merchant Prince," etc. With Illustrations. Quarto, pp. 509. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1883.

The Preacher and His Sermon. A Treatise on Homiletics. By Rev. JOHN W. ETTER, B.D., Quarto, pp. 581. Dayton, Ohio: United Brethren Publishing House. 1883.

A Complete Concordance to the Revised Version of the New Testament. Embracing the Marginal Readings of the English Revisers, as well as those of the American Committee. By JOHN ALEXANDER THOMS. Published under the Authorization of Oxford and Cambridge Universities. Quarto, pp. 532. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883.

The Parabolic Teaching of Christ. A Systematic and Critical Study of the Parables of our Lord. By ALEXANDER BALMAIN BRUCE, D.D., Professor of Apologetics and New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. 8vo, pp. 515. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1883.

God and the Future Life. The Reasonableness of Christianity. By CHARLES NORDHOFF, Author of "Politics for Young Americans," "Cape Cod and All Along Shore," "The Communistic Societies of the United States," etc. 16mo, pp. 228. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1883.

Harper's Young People, 1883. 8vo, pp. 840. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The Pulpit Treasury. An Evangelical Monthly. 8vo, pp. 124. New York: E. B. Treat.

Mosaics of Grecian History. The Historical Narrative, with Numerous Illustrative Poetical and Prose Selections; A Popular Course of Reading in Grecian History and Literature. By MARCUS WILSON and ROBERT PIERPONT WILSON. 12mo, pp. 554. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1883.

Electra. A Belles-Lettres Monthly for Young People. Edited by ANNIE E. WILSON and ISABELLA M. LEYBURN. 8vo, pp. 336. Published by Isabella M. Leyburn, Louisville, Ky.

Gossip about America and Europe. By RAM CHANDRA BOSE, M.A., Author of "The Truth of the Christian Religion," etc. Published by the C. M. C. Press. 16mo, pp. 274. Lucknow. 1883.

Special Providence Illustrated. Quarter-Centennial Sermon, by Rev. J. O. PECK, D.D., in the Hanson Place Methodist Episcopal Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., October 21, 1883. Published by Request. Pamphlet, 12mo, pp. 38. New York: Willis M'Donald & Co. 1883.

An Autobiography. By ANTHONY TROLLOPE, Author of "The Warden," "Barchester Towers," "Doctor Thorne," "Framley Parsonage," "He Knew he was Right," "Phineas Finn," "The Prime Minister," etc. 12mo, pp. 329. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1883.

The Story of Young Margaret. By LENA GILBERT FELLOWS. 12mo, pp. 354. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1883.

Stories of Patriotism and Devotion. For Young People. Translated from the French. By Mrs. BELLE TEVIS SPEED. 12mo, pp. 325. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. New York: Phillips & Hunt. 1883.

Thicker Than Water. A Novel. By JAMES PAYN, Author of "A Confidential Agent," "Kit, a Memory," "For Cash Only," "A Beggar on Horseback," "By Proxy," "The Best of Husbands," etc. 12mo. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1883.

What Social Classes Owe to Each Other. By WILLIAM GRAHAM SUMNER, Professor of Political and Social Science in Yale College. Small 12mo, pp. 169. New York. Harper & Brothers. 1883.

The Gospel According to Moses; or, the Import of Sacrifice in the Ancient Jewish Service By W. W. WASHBURNE, A.M., of the Detroit Conference. 12mo, pp. 90. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. New York: Phillips & Hunt. 1883.

The Clerical Library: Pulpit Prayers. By Eminent Preachers. 12mo, pp. 287. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1884.

Outlines of Sermons to Children. With numerous Anecdotes. 12mo, pp. 300. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. 1884.

Small Things. By REESE ROCKWELL. Small 12mo, pp. 231. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1883.

The Gospel According to John Explained. By WILLIAM MULLIGAN, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature in the University of Aberdeen, and WILLIAM F. MOULTON, D.D., Master of the Leys School, Cambridge. Small 12mo, pp. 443. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883.

Lessons on the Life of Jesus. By Rev. WILLIAM SCRIMGEOUR BRIDGEGATE, Free Church, Glasgow. 12mo, pp. 232. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1883.

Prayer and its Answer. Illustrated in the first Twenty-Five Years of the Fulton-street Prayer-Meeting. By S. IRENÆUS PRIME, D.D., Author of "The Power of Prayer," "Five Years of Prayer," "Fifteen Years of Prayer." etc. 12mo, pp. 171. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1882.

Ripe Grapes; or, The Fruit of the Spirit. By Rev. W. H. POOLE, LL.D., Pastor of Simpson Methodist Episcopal Church, Detroit, Mich. Small 12mo, pp. 163. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. New York: Phillips & Hunt. 1881.

J. Fletcher
Madeley.

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1884.

ART. I.—"WESLEY'S DESIGNATED SUCCESSOR."

[illegible] since the "beloved disciple" fell asleep, has there [illegible] this earth a saintlier man than Jean Guillaume De La [illegible]ure. The aroma of his character and life has been [illegible]ched wherever Wesleyan Methodism has reared its stand- [illegible] in the earth. How true it is that, whenever God has a [illegible] of work to perform, he has always his instruments ready to [illegible]wer his call, and accomplish his purposes! This fact, [illegible] has its clearest illustration in all the grand eras and [illegible] of the history of the Church, is abundantly confirmed [illegible] inauguration and mighty movement of the great eight- [illegible] century revival. There was John Wesley, whom [illegible] calls "The first of theological statesmen;" Charles [illegible]ley, the sweetest singer of Israel for nearly three thousand [illegible] whose hymns of love and praise will go ringing down [illegible] until they mingle with the millennial songs; George [illegible]d, the mightiest preacher of the last three centuries; [illegible]s Coke, Methodism's first bishop and earliest missiona- [illegible]ry; Asbury, the apostle of Methodism and evangelical [illegible]ory in America; and John Fletcher, that saintly and [illegible] man; and, without doubt, the greatest controversialist [illegible]. Each of these wonderful men had his own work [illegible] him; no one of them could do the work of the other; [illegible] were essential in carrying out the great designs of provi- [illegible]d grace.

J. Fletcher
Madeley.

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1884.

ART. I.—"WESLEY'S DESIGNATED SUCCESSOR."

NEVER, since the "beloved disciple" fell asleep, has there trod this earth a saintlier man than Jean Guillaume De La Flechère. The aroma of his character and life has been breathed wherever Wesleyan Methodism has reared its standards in the earth. How true it is that, whenever God has a great work to perform, he has always his instruments ready to answer his call, and accomplish his purposes! This fact, which has its clearest illustration in all the grand eras and epochs of the history of the Church, is abundantly confirmed in the inauguration and mighty movement of the great eighteenth century revival. There was John Wesley, whom Buckle calls "The first of theological statesmen;" Charles Wesley, the sweetest singer of Israel for nearly three thousand years, whose hymns of love and praise will go ringing down the ages until they mingle with the millennial songs; George Whitefield, the mightiest preacher of the last three centuries; Thomas Coke, Methodism's first bishop and earliest missionary; Francis Asbury, the apostle of Methodism and evangelical Christianity in America; and John Fletcher, that saintly and seraphic man; and, without doubt, the greatest controversialist of his age. Each of these wonderful men had his own work assigned him; no one of them could do the work of the other; but all were essential in carrying out the great designs of providence and grace.

Especial attention has been called of late to the character, the life, and the work of the last named of this list of worthies by the publication of Mr. Tyerman's book on "Wesley's Designated Successor." Mr. Wesley, amid the pressure of multiplied engagements, and the heavier pressure of advancing years and growing infirmities, had prepared a brief biography of him; but it was very imperfect. Mr. Benson, in 1804, wrote a "Life of Fletcher," which for nearly fourscore years has been the accepted account of his life and work in all the families of Methodism. The author of this work has had exceptional advantages in its preparation for the press. In writing his volumes on "The Life and Times of Wesley" he had met with all the great facts in the early history of the Church, and had seen the all-important part which Mr. Fletcher had taken in this mighty religious reformation. Since then he has diligently followed up his pursuit of every thing which could be known of this distinguished man, until, in writing his book, he feels warranted in saying in his Preface, "I think I may say, without exposing myself to the charge of arrogance or conceit, that in this volume the reader will find all the facts of any importance that are known concerning Fletcher."

He was born in Nyon, Switzerland, on the 12th of September, 1729. His family was one of the most respectable in that grand old republic, being, in fact, a "branch of an earldom of Savoy." He says of the house in which he was born: "It has one of the finest prospects in the world. We have a shady wood near the lake, (Leman,) where I can ride in the cool all the day, and enjoy the singing of a multitude of birds." Of his early life but little is known. A few incidents only are preserved, which tell of hair-breadth escapes from perils and dangers, and show us his tenderness of conscience and his fear of God. His education, begun in Nyon, was carried forward in the University of Geneva, which was only fifteen miles from his ancestral home. After completing his course there, his father sent him to Lentzburg, where, besides pursuing other studies, he acquired the German language. On returning to his home he applied himself to the study of Hebrew and mathematics. Thus was God preparing him for the work which he had for him to do. The University of Geneva, as well as the University of Oxford, was to have its share in

training God's instruments for the revival which was to shake the world.

He dates his religious convictions from an early period in his life. So true is it that those whom God designs for a special work he begins to train early. He relates himself: "I think it was when I was seven years of age that I first began to feel the love of God shed abroad in my heart, and that I resolved to give myself up to him, and to the service of his Church, if ever I should be fit for it."

But, although his studies had been pursued with a design to enter into the holy orders of the ministry, yet upon the very threshold of this work he was startled, horrified, and "disgusted by the necessity he would be under to subscribe to the doctrine of predestination." His conscience in this respect was not so elastic as that of some of our modern ministers who, professing to be Arminians in their theology, gulp down the whole Calvinistic system without a qualm.

His attention was now turned, according to the wishes of his friends, although not of his parents, to the army. Having studied the works of Cohorn and Vauban, the great military engineers of his day, he went to Lisbon, and there raised a company of his own countrymen to fight in the strife between Portugal and Brazil. While waiting for the ship to sail, the maid who waited on him at the breakfast table "let the tea-kettle fall upon his leg, which so scalded him that he had to keep his bed." Wesley adds: "During that time the ship sailed for Brazil, but it was observed that the ship was heard of no more." Upon what seemingly small and trivial events God often turns the course and destinies of a whole life-time! That tea-kettle, and that scalded leg, changed the religious history of the world. A subsequent effort to enter the Dutch service also failed, and he abandoned, henceforth, all idea of military life.

We next find him in England, whither he had gone, with other young gentlemen, to acquire the English language. This was another link in the great chain of providences which was to bind him forever to the service of the Church—both militant and triumphant. His desire to become acquainted with the English tongue having been realized, he obtained a situation as tutor in the family of Thomas Hill, Esq., of Fern

Hall, in Shropshire. And here occurred the change which to him, and to all who experience it, is the beginning of a new life, the starting-point of a new career, the upspringing of a well of water which is unto life eternal. This was his clear, undoubted, scriptural conversion. God spoke to his inmost soul in a dream, in which the fiery terrors and dread alarms of that great day of judgment were vividly portrayed before his mind, and he was assured that he was not prepared to meet it. This awakened a wild tumult of doubt and fear, of conviction for sin and dread of its terrible consequences. Right in the midst of this an incident occurred which is of interest to every Methodist.

When Mr. Hill went up to London to attend the Parliament, he took his family and Mr. Fletcher with him. While they stopped at St. Albans he walked out into the town, and did not return until they were set out for London. A horse being left for him, he rode after, and overtook them in the evening. Mr. Hill asked him why he stayed behind. He said, "As I was walking, I met with a poor old woman, who talked so sweetly of Jesus Christ that I knew not how the time passed away." "I shall wonder," said Mrs. Hill, "if our tutor does not turn Methodist by and by." "Methodist, madame!" said he, "pray, what is that?" She replied, "Why, the Methodists are a people that do nothing but pray; they are praying all day and all night." "Are they?" said he; "then, by the help of God, I will find them out!" He did find them out, joined the society, and met in Mr. Richard Edwards's class.

As soon as the new, divine life was consciously enjoyed in his soul, he devoted himself earnestly to the service of his Master. Whole nights were spent each week in reading the Scriptures, and in other devotional exercises. Now, also, there returned upon him deep, earnest convictions, the pressure of a divine call to devote himself to the work of the ministry. And so, after consultation with Mr. Wesley, he was ordained to the holy work of the ministry, to which he had been set apart by his parents, which he had hesitated to enter upon before his conversion, but which now was the height of his sanctified ambition. Mr. Wesley had been longing for some one to help him in his large sacramental services. His request was now granted, and he writes, "How wonderful are the ways of God! When my bodily strength failed, and none in England were able and willing to assist me, he sent me help from the mountains of

Switzerland, and a helpmeet for me in every respect. Where could I have found such another?"

It seems, indeed, very strange that one so gifted and so devoted should be three years after his ordination without a church appointment. But so it was. He was evidently an unpopular minister among the ungodly and the worldly. When he preached at Atcham on "Ye adulterers and adulteresses," etc., Vaughan says, "The congregation stood amazed, and gazed upon him as if he had been a monster, but to me he appeared as a messenger sent from heaven." Soon the churches began to be closed against him; but by those who were evangelical in the Church, and by Mr. Wesley's societies, his services and sermons were highly appreciated. Nor were his ministrations ineffectual. Not only were believers comforted and built up, but instances of conversion of the most cheering character occurred. Hearing of the wonderful scenes which had been witnessed at Everton, under the preaching of Berridge, Mr. Fletcher desired to see them for himself. Arriving at the place, he introduced himself to Berridge as a "new convert who had taken the liberty to wait upon him for the benefit of his instruction and advice." Perceiving by his accent that he was a foreigner, he asked him what countryman he was. He replied, "A Swiss, from the Canton of Berne." "From Berne! then, probably, you can give me some account of a young countryman of yours, John Fletcher, who has lately preached a few times for the Messrs. Wesley, and of whose talents, learning, and piety they both speak in terms of high eulogy. Do you know him?" "Yes, sir, I know him intimately; and did those gentlemen know him as well, they would not speak so highly of him. He is more obliged to their partial friendship than to his own merits." "You surprise me," said Berridge. "I have the best reason for speaking of John Fletcher as I do. I am John Fletcher." "If you be John Fletcher," replied Berridge, "you must take my pulpit to-morrow."

It was in this place, not long afterward, that Mr. Fletcher witnessed one of those wonderful displays of the divine power and glory which were so frequent under the mighty ministrations of the early Methodists, both in the Arminian and Calvinistic branches. There were present on the occasion referred

to, besides Berridge and himself, Venn and Madan and the Countess of Huntingdon. And while they preached and prayed and sang for three days to congregations numbering thousands of people, men and women wept bitterly, and fell to the ground as dead. No wonder that, as the services closed, the whole assembly joined in singing one of Mr. Wesley's hymns, so familiar to our older Methodists:

> "Arm of the Lord, awake, awake!
> Thine own immortal strength put on!"

The circumstances connected with his appointment to Madeley are of so much interest that we must refer to them here. The living at Durham had been proffered to him. "It is a small parish," said Mr. Hill, his patron, "the duty is light, the income good, ($2,000, equal to $5,000 now,) and it is situated in a fine, healthy, sporting country." "Alas!" replied Fletcher, "alas! sir, Durham will not suit me: there is too much money, and too little labor." "Few clergymen make such objections," said Mr. Hill. "It is a pity to decline such a living, especially as I know not that I can find you another. What shall we do? Would you like Madeley?" "That, sir," said Fletcher, "would be the very place for me." Singularly enough, the two patrons of Durham and Madeley, uncle and nephew, "met at the Shrewsbury races, and there, on a *race-course*, of all places in the world, it was settled that the Madeley living should be offered to Fletcher."

Here were met the questions which have engaged the attention and demanded the consideration of Methodists for more than a century, namely: Should the ministry be wholly itinerant, or wholly settled; or can it be partly itinerant and partly settled, according to circumstances? Mr. Wesley was, doubtless, a born itinerant. It was from the fullness of his heart that he cried, "The world is my parish!" He was an "angel *flying* through the midst of heaven, having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth;" and his wings could not long be folded, nor his voice long silent. On the other hand, Mr. Fletcher's whole nature demanded quietude, retirement, settledness. These tendencies of his nature must have been very strong to enable him to go against the urgent and oft-repeated counsels of Mr. Wesley to adopt an itinerant life. The sequel, however, will show that

Mr. Fletcher was right in the choice which he made. And we cannot help thinking that, if it had been possible to combine from the beginning the settled with the itinerant ministry, Methodism would have been stronger to-day than it is. The itinerancy is not suited to all men. There are many to whom it is revolting, or who shrink from it with dread. There are others who love its change—its variety of labors, and its ever fresh and new fields of toil. They are evangelists. God has called them to do this work, and they do it well, do it grandly. But others are just as truly pastors and teachers, and the nature which God has given them, and the character of the work which they are called to do, require time, maturity of plans of study, and work, and to all this the itinerancy is unfavorable. A very large number of the most excellent and cultured men have been lost to us simply because of their want of adaptation to the life and work of an itinerant. It is easy to say, "Let them go; we are better off without them than with them." But so long as they were *one* with us in doctrine and dispciline, and in the fervor and fire of their ministrations; and since their learning and culture, in many instances, have been needed among us, no doubt, if we could have retained them and utilized them, they would have been even a greater benediction to us than they have been in the Churches where they have found a home. No cast-iron system will answer in any ecclesiastical arrangements—whether of a settled pastorate on the one hand, or of an itinerancy upon the other. There must be sufficient elasticity in the system to take in and make useful every grade of talent and every class of workmen. The problem which Methodism must solve in the not distant future is, can these two ideas of the permanent and the itinerant pastorate be combined in one system? Some hastily say, "It can never be done." We think it can be, and that the calm, deliberate wisdom of the Church will find an answer to the inquiry. Our early history seems to teach that both the Arminian and Calvinistic branches were combined in one Methodism, and a permanent and itinerant ministry may yet be combined in our Churches. Of course, it does not enter within the scope of this article to argue these questions. We merely refer to them as facts which meet us in the lives of Wesley and Fletcher. If Mr. Fletcher had become an

itinerant, as Mr. Wesley so earnestly desired that he should, we would never have known, in all probability, those mighty tomes which for more than a hundred years have stood as a great bulwark against Antinomianism, ultra-Calvinism, and Necessitarianism. Methodism, lacking such defenses, might have been, like Mr. Whitefield's converts, "a rope of sand," instead of being, as now, the most compact and cohesive body, so far as doctrinal belief is concerned, in the world. As a system of evangelism, Methodism has never been equaled in the history of this world. But as a system of culturing converts, and training up a body of strong, steadfast, intelligent workers, especially in our large cities, it has not been so efficient.

In the parish vestry of Madeley is, or was, a book with the following: "John Fletcher, clerk, was inducted to the Vicarage of Madeley, the 17th of October, 1760." "Madeley is a market-town in the county of Salop. It is beautifully situated in a winding glen, through which the river Severn flows. In 1800, fifteen years after Fletcher's death, it contained, according to parliamentary returns, 291 houses, and 4,758 inhabitants. The church is dedicated to St. Michael, and the parish includes Coalbrook Dale and Madeley Wood, noted for their coal-mines and iron-works." Here, in the midst of this community, largely composed of ignorant and brutal men, inexperienced in parish work as he was, with no one near him to sympathize with his Methodistic views, he began his earnest evangelistic and parochial labors. He was full of heart and of hope. His congregations grew amazingly, and he looked for immediate and wonderful results. But in this he was doomed to disappointment. Opposition speedily manifested itself against his plain and faithful preaching against drunkenness, shows, and bull-baiting. On one occasion he barely escaped violence at the hands of some of his enraged and drunken parishioners.

One Sunday evening, Mr. Fletcher, after performing the usual duty at Madeley, was about to set out for Madeley Wood, to preach and catechize as usual. But just then a notice was brought that a child was to be buried. His waiting till the child was brought prevented his going to the Wood; and herein the providence of God appeared. For, at this very time, many of the colliers were baiting a bull just by the meeting-house; and having

had plenty to drink, they had all agreed, as soon as he came, *to bait the parson.* Part of them were appointed to pull him off his horse, and the rest to set the dogs upon him.

Specimens of his sermons are given in this volume which are awakening and startling in a high degree. It is not to be wondered at that men who would not give up their cherished sins were enraged at his faithful portrayal of the results of their ungodliness. With him there was no toning down of the thunders of Sinai, and no vailing of its blazing lightnings. He not only believed in a whole Christ and a whole heaven, but he also believed in a whole hell. And what he believed he spoke. We have room for only one of these specimens. The text was Ezekiel ii, 7. After having portrayed their sins and guilt before them, he proceeds as follows:

And now, sinner, think seriously with yourself what defense you will make to all this. Will you fly into the face of God, and that of your conscience, so openly as to deny one of the charges of rebellion, yea, of aggravated rebellion, I have advanced against you? Have you not lifted up yourself against the Lord of heaven? Have you not sided with his sworn enemies—the world and the flesh? What part of your body, what faculty of your soul, have you not employed as an instrument of unrighteousness? When did you live one day before God with the dependence of a creature, the gratitude of a redeemed creature, the heavenly frame of a sanctified creature? Yea, when did you live one hour without violating God's known law, either in word, in thought, or action? . . . Thousands are, no doubt, already in hell whose guilt never equaled yours; and yet God has spared you to see almost the end of another year, and to hear now this plain representation of your case. And will you not yet consider? Shall nothing move you to shake off that amazing carelessness and stupid disregard of your salvation? Will you never begin to "work it out with fear and trembling?" Will you slumber in impenitency until eternal woes crush you into destruction? Is death, is judgment, is the bottomless pit so distant, that you dare put off from week to week the day of your conversion? You have read in God's word that there is mercy with him that he may be feared; but where did you read there is mercy with him for those who fear him not? . . . Sinner, despise me *here* if thou wilt; call me *here* an enthusiast, and laugh at the concern I feel for the perishing soul, but *hereafter* thou wilt do me justice, clear me before the Lord Jesus, and acknowledge that thy blood is upon thine own head, that thou art undone because thou wouldst be undone, because thou wouldst take neither warning nor reproof.

This, with kindred specimens, the author well calls "thunder and lightning preaching." So, indeed, it was. Yet it was the eternal truth of God, not changing to suit men's notions or fancies, or bringing itself down to the low level of men's passions and propensities. How different was it from much of the preaching heard at that time! and how different from much that is heard at the present!—these sermonettes of the present day, with their diluted Gospel, in which no thunder-bolts are launched against ungodliness, lest they should give offense; in which no ringing terrors of the law are proclaimed; in which no endless hell, as the legitimate result of sin, is announced; but in which the demand of worldlings, "lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God," of men and women who are dreaming of going to heaven, with a wine-glass in one hand and a pack of cards in the other, of frequenters of the theater and the dance, is regarded, and obsequiously obeyed, by men professing to be ministers of God's word.

Such preaching as that of Fletcher's will create opposition in certain quarters, but it will redeem and save men, it will meet the approval of heaven, and it will prevent ministers from going with blood-stained garments to the judgment-seat of Christ. By such preaching souls were saved in Madeley and other places then, and such preaching will save souls now. But his fidelity as a preacher was only equaled by his faithfulness as a pastor. He visited the people at their homes, in the forges and collieries, catechized the children, built a church in Madeley Wood, to which he gave largely from his own private funds; and "for many years he regularly preached at places eight, ten, or sixteen miles distant, returning home the same night, though he seldom reached it before one or two in the morning." Two or three times in the week he preached at a place six miles from Madeley at five in the morning. And if he heard the knocker in the middle of the coldest winter night, his window was instantly thrown up, and the uniform answer was, "I will attend you immediately." When some of his charge made it an excuse that they could not attend service on Sunday *mornings* because they did not awake early enough to get their families ready, he took a bell in his hand, and at five in the morning went round the more distant parts of his parish, calling the people to the house of God. And he did all this while

he was living upon the scantiest fare himself, giving, at times, the furniture of his house and table for the poor; and not only spending his salary for the relief of the needy, but also his own private fortune. Indeed, the wonder is, how *he lived* on the scanty fare which he allowed himself. Mr. Wesley wrote of him: "He did not allow himself such food as was necessary to sustain nature. He seldom took any regular meals unless he had company; otherwise, twice or thrice in twenty-four hours he ate some bread and cheese, or fruit. Sometimes he took a draught of milk, and then wrote on again. When one reproved him for not affording himself a sufficiency of necessary food, he replied: 'Not allow myself food! Why, our food seldom costs my housekeeper and me less than two shillings a week!'" In this Fletcher undoubtedly erred. No man has a right to neglect or starve his body. Fasting and abstinence are good and right; but no one should practice them seven days in the week. He accomplished, it is true, a great amount of work on this simple diet; but if it had been more generous and regular he might have lived longer, preached and written more, and, indeed, have become "Wesley's Successor."

We must now turn our attention to his relations with the Trevecca College. This was an institution which had been projected by the Countess of Huntingdon. It was located at Trevecca, in Wales. Mr. Fletcher had been, from the beginning, one of the Countess's chosen advisers, and had been fixed upon as the future president of the college. It was designed to educate young men for the work of the ministry. It was opened by Mr. Whitefield on the 24th of August, 1768. A list of the books furnished by Mr. Fletcher to the Countess will show how meager was the course of study in that institution: "Grammar, logic, rhetoric, ecclesiastical history, and a little natural philosophy and geography, with a great deal of practical divinity. Watts's 'Logic,' and his 'History of the Bible,' Mr. Wesley's 'Natural Philosophy,' Mason's 'Essay on Pronunciation,' Henry and Gill on the Bible, four volumes of Baxter's 'Practical Works,' Keach's 'Metaphors,' Taylor on the 'Types,' Gurnal's 'Christian Armor,' Edwards on 'Preaching,' Johnson's 'English Dictionary,' Mr. Wesley's 'Christian Library,' Usher's 'Body of Divinity,' Scapula's Greek and Littleton's Latin Dictionary, Bailey or Dyke's Dictionaries,

for those who learn English; two or three of Coles's Dictionaries, Schrevelius and Pasor's, for those who will learn Greek and Latin." This was indeed a limited stock to begin with, but, doubtless, was as extended as that which many of the clergy of that day possessed. What branches Mr. Fletcher taught, or how often he visited the school, we do not know. But one thing is certain, his influence upon the students was of the most salutary and hallowing character. It has been suggested by a very able divine, somewhat facetiously, that all our theological institutions now need is a "Professor of Religion." Trevecca College had this wonderful advantage. Mr. Benson's account of his visits to this college is well worth transcribing here:

> He was received as an angel of God. It is not possible for me to describe the veneration in which we all held him. Like Elijah, in the school of the prophets, he was revered; he was loved; he was almost adored; not only by every student, but by every member of the family. And, indeed, he was worthy. The reader will pardon me if he thinks I exceed. My heart kindles while I write. Here it was that I saw, shall I say, an angel in human flesh? I should not far exceed the truth if I said so. But here I saw a descendant of fallen Adam, so fully raised above the ruins of the fall that, though by the body he was tied down to earth, his whole *conversation was in heaven.* His *life*, from day to day, was *hid with Christ in God.* Prayer, praise, love, and zeal, all ardent, elevated above what one would think attainable in this state of frailty, were the element in which he continually lived. As to others, his one employment was to call, entreat, and urge them to ascend with him to the glorious source of being and blessedness. He had leisure, comparatively, for nothing else. Languages, arts, sciences, grammar, logic, and even divinity itself, were all laid aside when he appeared in the school-room among the students. His full heart would not suffer him to be silent. He *must* speak; and they were readier to hearken to this servant and minister of Jesus Christ than to attend to Sallust, Virgil, Cicero, or any Latin or Greek historian, poet, or philosopher they had been engaged in reading. And they seldom hearkened long before they were in tears, and every heart catched fire from the flame that burned in his soul.

It is no wonder that, after such a presence among the students, and after listening to such burning words, when he invited those who were athirst for the fullness of the Spirit to follow him into his room, many went, where they would remain for hours, until they could kneel no longer. On such occasions

Mr. Fletcher himself would be so filled with the love of God as to cry out, "O my God, withhold thy hand, or the vessel will burst!"

And yet, this holy, this seraphic man, whose influence upon the students was so saintly and so salutary, was constrained, in a little while, to resign his presidency of the institution and to depart from its walls. The occasion for this is fully narrated in the volume before us.

On the 7th of August, 1770, Mr. Wesley held the Annual Conference of his preachers in London. Among other things suggested for the revival of the work of God was the following: "That the Methodists must be taught to seek and expect, not only *gradual*, but 'instantaneous sanctification.'" But this was not the only occasion of the trouble which removed Mr. Benson from Trevecca, and made the resignation of Mr. Fletcher desirable to himself, as well as, doubtless, to the Countess. This was found in the following questions and answers which called forth Mr. Fletcher's "Checks," and inaugurated a controversy which raged with the greatest bitterness on the part of the opponents of Arminianism for several years afterward:

We said, in 1744, "We have leaned too much toward Calvinism." Wherein? 1. With regard to *man's faithfulness*. Our Lord himself taught us to use the expression, and we ought never to be ashamed of it. We ought steadily to assert, on his authority, that if a man is not "faithful in the unrighteous mammon," God will not give him "the true riches." 2. With regard to *working for life*. This, also, our Lord has expressly commanded us, "Labor," ἐργάζεσθε, literally, "Work for the meat that endureth to everlasting life." And, in fact, every believer, till he comes to glory, works for as well as *from* life. 3. We have received it as a maxim, that "a man is to do nothing in order to justification." Nothing can be more false. Whoever desires to find favor with God "should cease from evil and learn to do well." Whoever repents should do "works meet for repentance." And if this is not in order to find favor, what does he do them for?

Review the whole affair.

1. Who of us is *now* accepted of God? He that now believes in Christ with a loving, obedient heart.

2. But who among those who never heard of Christ? He that "feareth God and worketh righteousness" according to the light he has.

3. Is this the same with "he that is *sincere?*" Nearly, if not quite.

4. Is not this *salvation by works?* Not by the *merit* of works, but by works as a *condition.*

5. What have we then been disputing about for these thirty years? I am afraid *about words.*

6. As to *merit* itself, of which we have been so dreadfully afraid. We are rewarded *according to our works,* yea, *because of our works.* How does this differ from *for the sake of our works?* And how differs this from *secundum merita operum* — "as our works deserve?" Can you split this hair? I doubt I cannot.

7. The grand objection to one of the preceding propositions, is drawn from a matter of fact. God does, in fact, justify those who, by their own confession, "neither feared God, nor wrought righteousness." Is this an exception to the general rule? It is a doubt whether God makes any exception at all. But how are we sure that the person in question never did fear God and work righteousness? His own saying so is not proof; for we know how all that are convinced of sin undervalue themselves in every respect.

8. Does not talking of a justified and sanctified *state* tend to mislead men, almost naturally leading them to trust in what was done in one moment? Whereas we are every hour and every moment pleasing or displeasing to God "according to our works" —according to the whole of our inward temper and outward behavior.*

Thus the broad line of distinction was drawn between Wesleyan Arminianism, and Calvinism and Antinomianism. Very soon the tocsin of war was sounded all along the line, and Mr. Fletcher for five years was engaged in unintermitting strife, until the last foe had abandoned the field, or confessed himself vanquished. There were no epithets which the opponents of the theses referred to thought to be too strong or too bitter to employ against Mr. Wesley and those who held with him. He was a "Pelagian," a "Pharisee," a "Papist," an "Antichrist." Mr. Benson, as we have seen, was dismissed by the Countess because he did not, could not, believe in "absolute predestination." Even a moderate (?) Calvinist had said to Mr. Fletcher that he was "in a damnable heresy, and never knew any thing of himself or of true grace, because he had taught that sinners perish for resisting and quenching the Spirit of grace." The Minutes were branded as "the very doctrines of Popery, yea, of Popery unmasked."

A deputation was appointed, with Shirley at its head, to attend Mr. Wesley's Conference, and, if possible, effect an

* "Minutes of the Methodist Conferences," vol. i, p. 97.

understanding. For this purpose a "declaration" was drawn up, which was amended by Mr. Wesley, and then signed by him and all the itinerant preachers present (except Thomas Ollivers). In this it was most positively affirmed that "we have no trust or confidence but in the alone merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ for justification, or salvation, either in life, death, or the day of judgment; and that our works have no part in meriting or purchasing our salvation from first to last, either in whole or in part."

This seemed eminently satisfactory to Shirley, who represented the Calvinists and the Countess. And here, perhaps, the strife might have ended. But Mr. Fletcher had already written his "First Check to Antinomianism," and it was in the printer's hands. Efforts were at once made to suppress it. But Mr. Wesley declined all offers in this direction, and it was published. It consisted of "Five Letters to the Hon. and Rev. Author of the Circular Letter" (Mr. Shirley.) It was at once answered by him. In this "First Check" Mr. Fletcher defends Mr. Wesley from the charge of heresy; while he clearly formulates the doctrines which were held and preached by him: depravity, redemption alone through the merits of Christ's death, holiness of heart and life, and the universality of the atonement. And in connection with this he clearly stated the necessity of the formulation of these doctrines, and the insistance upon *outward* as well as *inward* holiness.

The answer of the Hon. and Rev. Mr. Shirley having been published, it called forth "A Second Check." This contained three letters, was revised, as the first, by Mr. Wesley, and therefore indorsed by him. It was a dark picture of the condition of the ministry and laity of the Churches, and grapples with ungloved hands the dangerous and damning Antinomianism of the day. But if he had written with severity against this error in his first two "Checks," his attack was even more severe and trenchant in his third. Mr. Wesley wrote of it to his brother Charles: "In this he draws the sword and throws away the scabbard." It was written in reply to a publication by his friend and neighbor, Richard Hill, Esq., consisting of five letters addressed to him. Mr. Hill's Antinomianism was of the most pronounced character. A single specimen from his letters clearly shows the character of his theology:

Either Christ has fulfilled the whole law, and borne the curse, or he has not. If he has not, no soul can ever be saved; if he has, then all debts and claims against his people, be they more or be they less, be they small or be they great, be they before or be they after conversion, are forever and forever canceled. All trespasses are forgiven them. They are justified from all things. They already have everlasting life. They are now (virtually) sat down in heavenly places with Christ their forerunner; and as soon shall Satan pluck his crown from his head as his purchase from his hand.

Mr. Fletcher grapples with this idea of the *eternal justification* of the elect in the most masterly manner, and shows that such teachings "make the preaching of the Gospel one of the most absurd, wicked, and barbarous things in the world. For what can be more absurd than to say, 'Repent ye, and believe the Gospel;' 'He that believeth not shall be damned,' if a certain number can *never repent or believe*, and a certain number can *never* be damned." And still further on he says: "But when a good man gives us to understand that there are no lengths God's people may not run, nor any depths they may not fall into, without losing the character of men after God's own heart, that many will praise God for the denial of Christ, that sin and corruption work for good, that a fall into adultery will drive us nearer to Christ, and make us sing louder to the praise of free grace," he represents the danger to the Church as great indeed.

Again, Richard Hill, Esq., appeared in the arena, and with great bitterness attacked Mr. Wesley and Mr. Fletcher. Toplady, also, with an envenomed style, such as it is difficult to conceive possible for a man who wrote "Rock of Ages," violently assailed these leaders of the great religious movement of the eighteenth century. Rowland Hill, the eccentric brother of Richard, came to the aid of his brother, and endeavored to show the "glaring inconsistencies and palpable mistakes" of Mr. Fletcher. These attacks called forth the "Fourth Check to Antinomianism in thirteen letters to the Messrs. Hill." He fairly rains blows upon the system defended by them, employing a merciless irony, and holding up to ridicule the absurd reasonings of his opponents. A very brief specimen of this style of writing must suffice:

In this rich garment of *finished salvation* the greatest apostates shine brighter than angels, though they are "*in themselves*,

black" as the old murderer, and filthy as the brute that wallows in the mire. This "best robe," as it is called, is full trimmed with such phylacteries as these: "Once in grace, always in grace;" "Once justified, eternally justified;" "Once washed, always fair, undefiled, and without spot." And so great are the privileges of those that have it on, that they can range through all the bogs of sin, wade through the puddles of iniquity, and roll themselves in the thickest mire of wickedness, without contracting the least spot of guilt or speck of defilement.

It may occasion surprise to many that one so holy, so seraphic, even, as Mr. Fletcher, could write in this style. Such persons should not forget that the most scathing, withering irony and bitter invective ever uttered by human lips was uttered by God's mightiest prophet under the Old Testament dispensation, who was thought worthy to be translated to the heaven of heavens without tasting the pangs of death. Mr. Fletcher vindicates his use of this weapon in the following words: "If I make use of irony in my 'Checks' it is not from '*spleen*,' but *reason*. It appears to me that the subject requires it, and that *ridiculous error* is to be turned out of the temple of truth, not only with scriptural argument, which is *the sword of the Spirit*, but also with *mild irony*, which is a proper scourge for a glaring and obstinate mistake." The first part of Mr. Fletcher's "Fifth Check" was published in 1774, and was entitled "*Logica Genevensis* Continued," etc. In this Mr. Hill, Rev. Mr. Berridge, and others are noticed, and their publications severely reviewed. Meanwhile, between the publication of the fourth and fifth "Checks," he had published what may be regarded on the whole as his ablest work—"Appeal to Matter of Fact and Common Sense." This fifth and last "Check" seems to have cleared the field. His antagonists, one after another, were silenced, or sued for peace. As early as 1773 "Mr. Hill gave Fletcher full permission to make known the facts that the controversy had done him no good; that he desired to be humbled before God, and to ask forgiveness of Fletcher and Wesley for every thing that had 'savored of wrong' or of his own spirit in his writings; that he had stopped the sale of his publications; and that he regarded many of Wesley's people as the excellent of the earth." In 1776 Mr. Fletcher visited Berridge at Everton, whose "Christian World Unmasked" he had so utterly demolished. The instant

he entered the parsonage at Everton, Berridge rose up, ran to meet him, embraced him with folded arms, and cried, "My dear brother, how could we write against each other, when we both aim at the same thing—the glory of God, and the good of souls? My book lies quietly on the shelf, and there let it be." Toplady died in 1778, when only in the thirty-eighth year of his age, and was buried in a grave, thirteen feet deep, under the gallery of Whitefield's chapel in Tottenham Court Road. Although converted through the instrumentality of one of Mr. Wesley's itinerants, he had been one of his most bitter foes. But the Methodists of the present generation, while holding in utter abhorrence his supralapsarian Calvinism, and his dangerous Antinomianism, have long since forgiven the man who could write so sweetly of Christ, and for years past very many of them have been singing as a chorus to Charles Wesley's inimitable hymn, "Jesus lover of my soul," a part of Toplady's equally well-known, and universally cherished, hymn, "Rock of ages, cleft for me." Lady Huntingdon sought an interview with Mr. Fletcher in view of the peace of the Church. Shirley also visited him when ill at Stoke Newington, and so did Rowland Hill.

Thus the long controversy ended, and Mr. Fletcher remained master of the field. He had cleared away the barriers which were reared in the way of evangelical Christianity, and had gained for Wesleyan Arminianism the right of way to the heart of the world. His "Checks," his "Appeal to Matter of Fact and Common Sense," his "Manual on Christian Perfection," and his "Portrait of St. Paul," must ever remain classics in Methodist literature. They furnished to our fathers, in the ministry and in the laity, the great arguments in their assaults against Calvinism in Europe and America. They were to them the richly stored arsenal from whence they were abundantly supplied with weapons, the keenness of whose edge and the fineness of whose temper made them irresistible in their onslaughts upon this system of horrible decrees and its logical corollary of Antinomianism. It is perhaps hardly worth while, in this brief review, to turn aside to notice the fact that Mr. Fletcher, in his eschatological views of the Scripture, was, without doubt, a millenarian; or to consider his pamphlet on the American struggle, which, while to us it seems unfortunate,

was doubtless regarded by him as simply a proof of his loyalty to his government and his adopted country. It was this pamphlet which Lord Dartmouth carried to King George, who immediately commissioned an official to ask him if any preferment in the Church would be acceptable to him, or whether the Lord Chancellor could do him any service. To all this Mr. Fletcher replied, "I want nothing but more grace."

After these weary years of conflict and strife, which he maintained with so much vigor, although his pure spirit and his brilliant and cultured intellect dwelt in a frail house of clay, which was emaciated with perpetual fastings and enfeebled by lurking disease, he felt the need of retirement and rest. This period was much longer than he had anticipated, continuing for three years. The most of this time was spent in the south of France and in Switzerland, his own native clime and home. Here, as his strength permitted, he preached, taught the children, wrote letters, and composed a poem in French, entitled "La Grace et la Nature." His retirement having improved his health, he returned to England, and we find him preaching in the City Road Chapel, and also in Bristol. Mr. Rankin, who had been in America for five years, and had been driven home on account of the War of Independence, was now stationed in Bristol Circuit. He writes of his visit to Bristol as follows:

> The whole congregation was in tears. He spoke like one who had just left the converse of God and angels. . . . Of all the men I ever knew, I never saw such love to God and man, such deadness to the world, such consecratedness to Jesus Christ, as in him. It often appeared to me that his every breath was prayer and praise. He lived more like a disembodied spirit than a human being.

It was not long after his return to England that his thoughts were directed to the subject of his marriage. His increasing years, his growing infirmities, his many cares, and his conscious loneliness, drew his attention to this question. His heart at once turned toward Miss Bosanquet, whom he had known so long and so well; and, at the same time, her heart was turned toward him. In her efforts to do good to others, both children and adults, she had already expended a large fortune, (£10,500, or $52,250, worth now about $200,000,) and had become involved in financial difficulties. And the impression was deep

in her mind that Mr. Fletcher was the only one who could aid her in her efforts, and relieve her of her embarrassments. The preliminaries of the marriage were arranged upon the most honorable basis, and with the utmost delicacy and Christian refinement, by Mr. Fletcher. At length the day for the marriage arrived. And perhaps the world has never witnessed such a wedding day. Mr. Fletcher, dressed in his canonicals, gave out one of Mr. Wesley's marriage hymns at the house, and read Rev. xix, 7–9. And so before they left for the church, on the way to it, and after their return, the time was spent in singing, prayer, and scriptural exposition. At night there was preaching. Mr. Wesley and all the early Methodists were greatly pleased with this union of two such holy persons. For nearly four bright and beautiful years this union was continued, and then death came and released the blood-washed, seraphic spirit, to find its eternal dwelling-place in the presence of God.

Mr. Fletcher's "Treatise on Christian Perfection," with Mr. Wesley's "Plain Account" of the same great truth, must forever remain the great text-books of Methodism on this so little understood question. He not only saw the truth of this doctrine gleaming from the pages of divine truth, and glowing in the hymns and sermons of John and Charles Wesley, and exhibited in the saintliness of Hester Ann Rogers, Miss Bosanquet, and others; but his own clear and joyous experience enabled him to write upon this subject with a clearness which has characterized no other writer excepting Mr. Wesley. His statement of his own experience, as recorded by Mrs. H. A. Rogers, will always be dear to the hearts of Methodists in all parts of the world. It was given in the fifty-second year of his age, in a select company of friends, and is as follows:

"For many years I have grieved His Spirit; I am deeply humbled; and he has again restored my soul. Last Wednesday evening, he spoke to me by these words: 'Reckon yourselves therefore to be dead indeed unto sin; but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.' I obeyed the voice of God: I now obey it; and tell you all, to the praise of his love, *I am freed from sin.* Yes, I rejoice to declare it, and to be a witness to the glory of his grace, that I am dead unto sin, and alive unto God through Jesus Christ, who is my Lord and my King! I received this blessing four or five times before; but I lost it by not observing the order of God, who has told us, 'With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is

made unto salvation.'" After further declaring how Satan had deceived him, he said, "Now, my brethren, you see my folly. I have confessed it in your presence; and *now* I resolve before you all to confess my Master. I will confess him to all the world. And I declare unto you, in the presence of the Holy Trinity, I am now *dead indeed unto sin.*"

No review of Mr. Fletcher's life could be complete without reference to his rich experience of the fullness of Christ's salvation. Holiness unto the Lord was not only realized in the depths of his consciousness as a real condition and blessed experience, but it was also written upon his breastplate, upon his shining face, and upon his whole character and life. In the gallery of the portraits of saints his picture will ever stand nearest to that of the beloved St. John.

At length the end of his wonderful life drew near. The "fever" had been raging in Madeley for many days. His visits among his sick and dying parishioners were unremitting, and his anxieties for them were constantly pressing upon his soul. Even after the fever came upon him, he went out to attend to his parochial duties. On Sabbath, August 7, he preached his last sermon, and continued the service until nearly two o'clock. After the sermon he went up the aisle to the communion table with these words: "I am going to throw myself under the wings of the cherubim, before the mercy-seat." As soon as the service was over he fainted. On the following Wednesday he told his beloved companion that he had received such a full manifestation of the meaning of the words, "God is love," as he could not tell. "It *fills* me," he said, "it *fills me* every moment. O, Polly! my dear Polly! *God is love!* Shout! Shout aloud! O, it so fills me that I want a gust of praise to go to the end of the earth!" Finding his articulation failing, he agreed with Mrs. Fletcher upon a sign which would tell her, when he could speak no more, of God's love. His servant Sally, coming in the room, he said, "O, Sally! God is love! Shout, both of you! I want to hear you shout his praise!" When Mrs. Fletcher repeated the lines of Johann A. Rothe's hymn, as translated by John Wesley,

> "While Jesus' blood, through earth and skies,
> Mercy, free, boundless mercy, cries,"

he cried out, "*Boundless! Boundless!*" and added with great difficulty,

> "Mercy's *full* power I *soon* shall prove,
> Loved with an everlasting love."

His last act upon earth was to raise his right hand again and again in token of the presence of Jesus with him, and of the glory which was breaking upon his soul. After being for twenty-four hours in a comatose state, "he was not; for God took him."

Our purpose in this review has been to give a bird's-eye view of the character and life of this wonderful man of God. Following the full and graphic account furnished by Mr. Tyerman in his invaluable book, we have grouped together, in a succinct form, its salient points. Those who desire ampler information concerning him should by all means obtain and read carefully the entire volume. His name is still, after nearly a century has passed since he went up on high, "as ointment poured forth." The aroma will fill the Church of God for ages to come. Many pilgrims annually make their way to Madeley, to view the place where he labored and wrote and fell asleep in Jesus; and where his precious remains rest. Precious relics of him are shown to visitors by the vicar and his wife: a lock of his silken hair; his study, nine feet by twelve, a portion of whose wall is still stained with his breathings while engaged in prayer; the oaken communion-table at which he celebrated his last sacrament, and the Church Register, containing a list of the baptisms, marriages, and deaths during his incumbency. Two monuments have been erected to his memory—one at Madeley, with an inscription written by his widow; the other in City Road, London, "Methodism's Westminster Abbey," immediately under Wesley's monument, with an inscription by Richard Watson. Mr. Wesley, who for a number of years had designated Mr. Fletcher as his successor, and urged him in vain to agree to his arrangement, lived and labored six years after his departure. So short-sighted is man; so limited his vision. But although the Wesleys, and Fletcher, and Coke, and the Fathers of the Church, have passed away, Methodism still lives, and Mr. Wesley has his successors in all parts of the world.

Art. II.—WILLIAM TYNDALE,

THE FIRST TRANSLATOR OF THE BIBLE INTO THE PRINTED ENGLISH VERNACULAR.

Educational Period, 1484–1519.

In one of the loveliest districts of England, lying along the banks of the Severn, and sprinkled with villages, church steeples, and ancient castles, is the hamlet of North Nibley. Here, under the shadows of the ancestral fortress of the Saxon Earls of Berkeley, was born William Tyndale, the first translator of the Holy Scriptures into the printed English vernacular. The year of his birth is uncertain. Probably it was in 1484. The closing quarter of the fifteenth century was prolific of children who subsequently rose to the highest stature of Christian manhood. The birth of Martin Luther at Eisleben, in Germany, and that of Ulrich Zwingle, the Swiss reformer, on the mountains of the Tockenburg, was nearly synchronous with that of Tyndale, whose history is largely "lost in his work, and whose epitaph is the Reformation." *

Little is certainly known of his ancestry. Some writers state that his forefathers had held baronial rank, and had lost it through faithfulness to the falling fortunes of the Lancastrian claimants of the crown. Certain it is that, under Henry VII., who united in himself the houses of York and Lancaster, his parents were sufficiently wealthy to send their boy, at an early age, to the University of Oxford. There he studied grammar and philosophy in the school of St. Mary Magdalen; and also the learned languages, under the tuition of Grocyn, W. Latimer, and Linacre, the first classical scholars of England. Apt and assiduous, he soon obtained the customary diplomas of proficiency.

Better works than those of heathen antiquity next challenged his scrutiny. The Greek Testament, edited by the celebrated Erasmus, whom admirers called "the light of the world," was rousing Christendom from spiritual torpor. Tyndale turned to it as a work of learning, or manual of devotion, whose rare and manifold beauties were adapted to excite religious feeling. He found it to be all that he had conjectured, infinitely more

* Froude's "History of England," vol. ii, p. 40.

than he had imagined. It spoke to him in tones of divine authority. It pointed out the way of salvation from sin and its sequences. It presented the Lord Jesus Christ as the only and all-sufficient Saviour. It supplied all his religious and moral needs. With rapture greater than that of Archimedes, he shouted, "Ευρηκα!"—"I have found it!"

Gladly accepting the Christ as his Lord and Saviour, Tyndale is freely justified by grace through faith; exhibits such purity of life, and such charms of conversation, that he attracts the younger members of the University; tells them of the treasure he has found; invites them to share it; and dwells on its contents in his lectures on Greek literature. Ignorant and fanatical, the adherents of the papacy take alarm, and overwhelm both Greek literature and Greek lecturer with violent abuse. This is in 1517.

Persecuted at Oxford, Tyndale flees to Cambridge. There he meets with Bilney and Fryth, who have also been enlightened by the entrance of the word. Together they radiate still greater light and love on the spiritual night around them. They boldly declare that no religious rite or priestly absolutions can impart remission of sins; that assurance of forgiveness is to be had through faith alone, and that faith purifies the heart. Their doctrines strike at the root of priestly despotism, and cut off the hope of priestly gains. Who will pay for an absolution that is powerless and worthless? Thus queried the priests, who stormed at the young preachers as the Ephesian craftsmen had done against St. Paul. It soon became expedient for Tyndale, who had received priest's orders in 1502, to seek another field of toil. Full of faith in his Divine Master, and full of hope for the future of England, he left Cambridge in 1519.

The Reformation of the Christian Church had begun in several countries. It originated with God alone, and in the study of "God's word written." In Oxford, Cambridge, London, as in continental cities, the Greek Testament had many and diligent readers.

The times were ripe for the Reformation. The events which had threatened the destruction of Christianity in the East were overruled to its salvation in the West. Constantinople fell into the hands of the Turks in 1453. Greek professors and

Greek literature sought refuge from their merciless tyranny, and were warmly welcomed in the south and west of Europe. Classical learning revived in its new seats. Erasmus collated manuscripts of the New Testament, and edited and published the inspired volume, out of which the doctrines and polity of the Christian Church exclusively sprung. It was eagerly received by prepared readers. Under God, it changed the hearts and lives of many. It impelled them to examine the pretensions and organization of the Church of Rome. It opened their eyes to the hideous fact of that Church's apostasy, debasement, and slavery. Their hearts began to burn with holy desire for its reformation.

No one can paint in colors too dark the degradation and wickedness of the papal Church, as a whole, at that period. The Pontiff was its visible head, and the proud pretender to the vicegerency of Christ upon earth. As a temporal prince, he maintained armies and fought battles; as a diplomatist, he was crafty, intriguing, and deceitful; as a *viveur*, he and his court derided Christianity as a fable profitable to their lusts and pleasures. Rome was drunken with the blood of the saints. Savonarola, John Huss, Jerome of Prague, and many others had been burned at the stake, or otherwise put to a cruel death. England was on the same moral level with other European nations. Her clergy were not only ministers, but also politicians, tradesmen, mechanics, and brewers. They had ceased to preach, except on special occasions, and then they preached monkish fables, but the Gospel never. The priests were unmarried, but many were unblushing fathers of families. Multitudes of them were lascivious and lewd, partners with thieves, drunkards, brawlers, profane, vicious. Monasteries, for the most part, were cages of unclean birds. Many nunneries bore the reputation of brothels. Popery, then as now, was an Antichrist. It would not permit the people to pray in their native tongue. On the 4th of April, 1519, the year that Tyndale left Cambridge, "Dame Smith, Robert Hatchets, Archer, Hawkins, Thomas Bond, Wrigsham, and Landsdale were burned alive at Coventry, in the Little Park, for the crime of teaching their children the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and the Commandments of God," * in

* D'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation," vol. v, p. 171.

English. Popery dreads the truth, as the unknown criminal dreads discovery.

The commonwealth of England felt that the Church was mortally sick, but knew not how to diagnose the disease, nor where to find an appropriate remedy. The monks were more detested for their palpable frauds than for their brazen debaucheries. Both were foul and feculent. Ecclesiastical dignitaries openly kept women as concubines. Sometimes an individual would maintain five or six. But all this was borne more patiently than the impositions wherewith the monks extorted money. At St. Anthony's Convent, in Bristol, they exhibited "a tunic of our Lord, a petticoat of the Virgin, a part of the Last Supper, and a fragment of the stone upon which Jesus was born at Bethlehem. All these brought in money." * Mountebanks, tricksters, conjurers, and always liars in these deceptions, they hesitated not to do any thing that would fill their coffers, or gratify their carnal lusts.

The English were nauseated by the corruptions of Rome, and rebellious under her oppressions, but could not free themselves from her shackles until possessed of that Gospel which has brought life and immortality to light. Tyndale was to present them with that priceless boon, and that in their mother-tongue; and by presenting that truth which maketh free to bring them out of Egyptian darkness into Calvary's light—out of bondage into the glorious liberty of the children of God. The England that now is, with her greatness and glory, is instrumentally his work.

Determinative Period, 1519–1523.

Leaving Cambridge, Tyndale returned to the home of his parents. Soon afterward he was requested by Sir John Walsh, the owner of Sodbury Hall, to take charge of the education of his children, and accepted the invitation. Entering upon his new duties, Tyndale finds himself in a plain but large mansion, that commands an extensive view of the beautiful vale of Severn. Sir John is an old companion-in-arms of the puissant Henry VIII., and is a favorite with that willful monarch. He is genial, jovial, hospitable, and keeps open house for the fat rectors, rubicund friars, and all the churchly and civic notables

* D'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation," vol. ii, p. 88.

who delight to visit him. Doctrinal discussions arise between the priests and the tutor, who invariably carries his point by the aid of his Greek Testament. The priests fear the little book, and denounce it as "serving only to make heretics," and as "a conjuring-book, wherein every body finds what he wants." Tyndale replies with loving-kindness, but also with humor and biting sarcasm. "You set candles before images," he said; "and, since you give them light, why don't you give them food? Why don't you make their bellies hollow, and put victuals and drink inside?" The mummery which they called worship was not worthy of more respectful treatment.

Tyndale did not confine himself to controversies with the priests. He preached the evangelical doctrines to the inhabitants of the villages and to the citizens of Bristol. But much of the fruit of his itinerant ministry was lost because the people did not possess the word of God in their own language. They could not search the Scriptures to determine whether what he proclaimed were true or not. "Without the Bible," he exclaimed, "it is impossible to establish the laity in the truth." Then a great idea shot up in his mind: "It was in the language of Israel that the Psalms were sung in the temple of Jehovah; and shall not the Gospel speak the language of Israel among us? . . . Christians must read the New Testament in their mother-tongue." This was the decisive epoch in his life history. Thenceforward the translation of the Bible into the English vernacular became the dominating object of his ambition.

The priests resolved to crush the daring innovator. Rejecting the counsels of God, and following foolish fables, they rushed upon him "like unclean swine that follow their carnal lusts," tore his reputation to tatters, and excited the populace against him. But his purpose took deeper root, and gathered stronger force. "If God spares my life," said he, "I will take care that a plowboy shall know more of the Scriptures than you do." On the verge of arrest and condemnation to death, Tyndale quitted Sodbury Hall. Gathering up his papers and Greek Testament, he kisses the children, presses the hands of his benefactors, bids farewell to the smiling Severn, and departs; not knowing, like Abraham, whither he goes, but firmly set upon placing the Scriptures of God, in good, plain English, in the hands of his countrymen.

England had already enjoyed the gift of the Scriptures in the speech of its people. But those Scriptures were not printed; for the art of printing had not been invented. In 1380, John Wiclif, Rector of Lutterworth, and "the morning star of the Reformation," completed his translation of the Bible. It was the translation of a translation. Of Hebrew and Greek, the original vehicles of revelation, he knew nothing; but he was an excellent Latin scholar, and was assisted by learned men in rendering the Vulgate into nervous English. Between ten and fifteen years he toiled at his noble task. When it was finished, the labors of copyists began; and, ere long, the Bible, in whole or in portion, was circulated throughout England. A gracious revival of evangelical religion followed. The written Bible and Wiclif's works reached Bohemia, and there wrought that mighty religious movement which preceded the Germanic Reformation under Luther. Wiclif gave to England the written Bible, Tyndale was to present his mother country with the printed Bible.

Of all the printed books ever published, none has produced such astounding revolutions as the Greek Testament, edited by the erudite but cautious and vacillating Erasmus. The study of it emancipated nations from their intellectual bonds, and from their thralldom to the Pope of Rome, whose throne it shook to the very foundations. It woke up Christendom to intense activity, and gave an impetus to humanity whose force is unspent to-day, and which augments in proportion to the vigor of its operation.

Tyndale found a powerful auxiliary ready to aid in the dissemination of the Scriptures, and in the great enterprise of Christian reformation. The art of printing had approached perfection. In 1438, Laurenzes John Koster, of Haarlem, in Holland, had printed a work with blocks; in 1444 John Gutenberg, of Mainz, in Germany, invented cut metal types, and used them in printing the Bible; and in 1452 Peter Schæffer cast the first metal types in matrices, and thus brought the art to its consummation. Wiclif had struck the blow for the liberation of the human mind and heart. Germany responded to his heroic efforts. Genius awoke. The press was created. The holiest uses to which it could be applied were the multiplying of copies of the Bible. In those copies were

the seeds of religious and civil liberty, of true science, of high Christian art, of material prosperity, of the wide world's brotherhood, of eternal felicity to untold millions of the human family. The press never did a grander work than in the printing of Tyndale's English Bible.

Emigrant Period, 1523–1524.

After bidding a sad farewell to Sodbury Hall, Tyndale repaired to London, where he hoped for employment from the scholarly statesman, Cuthbert Tonstall, who then filled the metropolitan see. But he was disappointed. Tonstall greeted him with cold graciousness, inasmuch as he was recommended by Sir John Walsh, the king's old comrade; by Sir Harry Guilford, the king's controller; and also by a translation of the Greek orator Isocrates into elegant Latin, made by Tyndale himself. Yet Tonstall dared not employ him. The priests were too clamorous and threatening, and the prelate was too fond of riches, ease, and honor to incur peril by protecting a friend of the Gospel.

Tyndale does not despair. God, he says, will protect him. God did protect him. The daring and faithful Christian, the learned and imaginative scholar, and the touchingly eloquent preacher found a friend in Humphrey Monmouth, a rich but righteous merchant who had been edified by his sermons. "Come and live with me, and there labor," urged Monmouth; and Tyndale did so. Evangelical religion owes much to godly merchants.

In the house of his new friend, Tyndale studied day and night. John Fryth, the eminent mathematician, came from Cambridge to help him. Shut up in a little room, they translated chapter after chapter from the Greek into terse and telling English. The work went on apace. But it could not be finished in England. Tonstall turned persecutor, and men were punished for reading portions of the Bible in the vernacular. What will the courtly bishop do if he detects the translators at their work? The stake is his fiery protest against the translation and circulation of the Scriptures. Tyndale is not afraid of the pyre, but he does not wish to die before the great work of his life is done. A vessel is lying in the Thames, receiving her cargo for Hamburg. It is agreed that he shall

sail in her, and prosecute his undertaking under foreign skies. Monmouth gives him ten pounds. With his New Testament in hand, he shakes off the dust of his feet against the coarse and dissolute priests, and sails for the Elbe.

Lonely but courageous, the departing saint beheld the white cliffs of old Albion fade away in the distance; caught glimpses of the Low Countries which papal intolerance and Spanish cruelty would soon drench with blood and tears; greeted the primitive home of the English people on the Holstein shore, and passed up the crooked Elbe to the quaint free city where he was to enjoy brief repose and safety.

Germanic Period, 1524–1526.

Not in the commerce of Hamburg, not in its net-work of canals, not in its beautiful Binnen Alster, not in its splendid churches, is he now particularly interested. Higher things absorb thought and feeling. In a quiet lodging he perfected the translation of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, and then forwarded them as the first-fruits of the biblical harvest to the mother-land from which he had been thrust out.

About the end of 1524 he received ten pounds more from the princely Monmouth. By means of that sum he not improbably crossed the sandy plains of Brandenburg, visited Luther at Wittenberg, and took sweet counsel with the sturdy Saxon reformer.

In the spring of 1525, Tyndale turned his steps toward the Rhine, and secretly established himself at Cologne. In that rich and flourishing city were renowned printers, one of whom had warehouses in St. Paul's Church-yard, London. In Cologne, the matchless cathedral was slowly rising, and suggested the construction of a spiritual temple infinitely more glorious than that. The citizens prided themselves on possessing the bones of the English princess, St. Ursula, and her eleven thousand sister virgins. Tyndale's aim was to bring the breath of life upon the moral "dead bones" of his native land. In the cathedral were preserved the pretended remains of the Magi (*drei Könige Köln*) who came from the East to worship the infant Christ. Tyndale's hope was to crown his risen Lord with the love and loyalty of the English people.

Calling on the printer, Tyndale presented his manuscripts,

and ordered three thousand copies to be printed. Overjoyed, he saw the printing go forward. England, through his New Testament, will come into the obedience of Christ. But the brightness of the prospect was quickly obscured by densest clouds. Instigated by Cochlæus, Dean of Frankfort-am-Main, an inveterate persecutor; and by Herman Rincke, an imperial councilor, the Senate of Cologne forbade the printing to proceed. Brave and prompt in all his movements, Tyndale prevented the seizure of his precious goods by hastening to the printing-office, collecting the printed sheets and manuscripts, jumping into a boat, and rapidly ascending the Rhine, bearing with him the fortunes of the Anglo-Saxon race. When the vultures swooped down on their expected prey, it was only to be seized by disappointment and chagrin. The translator had escaped as a bird from the snare of the fowler, and none could guess whither he had flown.

On the historic Rhine, Tyndale and his assistant, Roye, contend for five or six days against the impetuous current. Antique cities and lovely villages adorn its banks; hoary mountains, frowning gorges, gloomy forests, scenes of exquisite pastoral beauty pass by in slow succession; ruined fortresses and Gothic churches, rich in legendary memories, present themselves to his gaze; boats pass and repass the lonely oarsmen; birds of prey soar and scream overhead: but Tyndale thinks little of these. His care is for the treasures of life that his bark contains. He passes the Siebengeberge under the Drachenfels—castle-crowned. Does he recall the myth of Siegfried, and of the dragon whose den was half way up the hill, five hundred feet above his head; that the hero slew the reptile, and made himself invulnerable by bathing in its blood? We know not. The spirit of Byron's beautiful lines was in his heart as he gazed on all the witching loveliness around him:

> "The castled crag of Drachenfels
> Frowns o'er the wide and winding Rhine,
> Whose breast of waters broadly swells
> Between the banks which bear the vine,
> And hills all rich with blossom'd trees,
> And fields which promise corn and wine,
> And scatter'd cities crowning these,
> Whose far white walls along them shine,
> Have strew'd a scene, which " I do see,
> With double joy, O Christ with me!

The last two lines are not as the poet wrote them. Tyndale was not an amorous sensualist. Christ the Lord was with his servant in the rocking boat, and gave him the assurance of victory over a dragon more destructive than that of fable to those who drew near his den. His hopes rose higher than Löwenberg on its dolerite hill, to a land more glorious than that of the Rhine when the sun looks down upon it through summer skies. Coblentz on the right, Ehrenbreitstein on the left, he passes with anxious haste; pauses a while at the mouth of the winding Lahn; pushes on under the shadows of the Kōnigsstuhle, where German emperors have been elected, decrees issued, treaties concluded; and strengthened himself in the resolve to enthrone his Master in the hearts of his countrymen. The twin castles of Sterrenberg and Liebenstein, with their weird legends of faithless love, broken hearts, and chivalrous devotion, move his poetic and impassioned temperament. Germany never saw more faithful and heroic knight than he. He may have tarried at St. Goar to buy provisions; have drained the customary cup of wine presented by the citizens; been crowned and invested with civic rights, and inscribed his name on the Hänselbuch. He did burn with godly desire to enroll all men in the society of the redeemed whose names are written in heaven.

Skillfully steering through the foaming rapids and seething whirlpools above St. Goar, and hugging the eastern shore of the stream, he rows under the cliffs of the Lurlei which, as poets sang, had formerly harbored a nymph whose siren songs enticed sailors and fishermen to destruction at the base of the precipice. Under the Lurlenberg, they said, was hidden the Niebelungen treasure. O Tyndale, braver and stronger than Siegfried!—through what rapids of cruelty, what whirlpools of wickedness, what siren songs of temptation must thou pass, ere the hidden treasure of God's word be freed from the heavy mountain of Romish superstition and lust, and its contents freely scattered among a thankful and joyous people! Although unseen by mortal eye, Christ is his companion in the lonely boat. Wine of divine love cheers his heart as he passes the delicious vintage of the Rüdesheimer Berg, and braces him for conflict with prelates as callous as Hatto of Mentz, whose Mause Thurm (Mouse Tower) he almost touches as it rises from the

bosom of the Rhine. That brutal ecclesiastic was said to have burned the famished poor. Rome then was burning the hungry souls who fainted from desire for the bread of life. Mainz now heaves in sight—Mainz, with its indelible memories of the English Winifred, the apostle of Central Germany —Mainz, the home of the printer Gutenberg, whose invention Tyndale will utilize in benefit of his darkened nation. Mainz also is left behind. Worn and weary, the boatman lands at last before the grand old city of Worms, where, in April, 1521, Luther had stated and defended his doctrines before Charles V. and the Imperial Diet.

Tyndale steps on shore, and lays down his precious burden upon the ground. What knows he of the future—of the enemies that watch for him—of the dangers that await him? His courage is equal to that of Luther, whom nothing could frighten. "Though they should kindle a fire all the way from Worms to Wittenberg, the flames of which reached to heaven, I would walk through it in the name of the Lord." "Go and tell your master that even should there be as many devils in Worms as tiles on the house-tops, still I would enter it," said the great reformer. He did enter it, boldly confessed his Lord, and rose to the heights of moral sublimity as he humbly affirmed before emperor and deputies: "Unless I am convinced by the testimony of Scripture, I cannot and will not retract. Here I stand; I can do no other. God help me! Amen." Wiclif had the English aristocracy at his back; Luther had powerful friends in the Diet, and warriors like Sickingen longed to flesh their swords in his defense; but Tyndale was alone, (except the feeble Roye,) unknown, and unfriended. His was the courage that singly dares the powers of earth and hell. Yet he was not alone, for Christ was with him.

Peter Schæffer gladly lent his presses to Tyndale's godly work. Two editions of the English New Testament were quietly struck off by the end of 1525, and in the beginning of 1526 were sent across the North Sea into England, and were followed night and day by the translator's prayers.

Tyndale's prayers were answered. Five pious Hanseatic merchants concealed his books among their merchandise, and sailed from Antwerp. As the vessel ascended the Thames, an

invisible hand dispersed the preventive guard. Tonstall and Henry VIII. were absent from London, and Cardinal Wolsey was too busy with politics to play the part of police detective. The New Testaments were safely landed. Thomas Garret, the curate of All-Hallows Church, received them into his house; sold them to all purchasers, whether priests, monks, or laymen; and thus the books were distributed over the entire realm. Every one devoured the contents of his purchase. Hearts melted like wax under its revelations, and marvelous moral transformations were wrought, even in the most papal families.

The Romish prelates soon discovered the state of affairs, and were filled with the utmost alarm. Orders were issued on the 3d of February, 1526, to seize and destroy the obnoxious books, so fatal to the supremacy of Antichrist. All that were captured were publicly burned, and the owners—after being compelled to cast their New Testaments into the fire—were immured in noisome prisons. Numbers died from their sufferings in jail, but others lived to become pastors and even bishops in the reformed Church of England. The Papal pursuit was untiring. The clergy asserted that the Holy Scriptures contained "an infectious poison." On the 24th of October the Bishop of London ordered his archdeacons to seize all English translations of the New Testament; and the Archbishop of Canterbury issued a mandate against all books that contained "any particle of the New Testament."* Tyndale's great life-work was now fairly under way, and all the rage and cruelty of his enemies were not permitted to hinder its accomplishment.

Belgic Period, 1526–1529.

The precise date of Tyndale's removal from Worms to Antwerp is not known, but must have been in the course of 1526. While the priests were busily hunting for copies of the Worms editions of the New Testament, a new and more dangerous, because smaller and more easily concealed, edition appeared to terrify them. It was printed by Christopher Eyndhoven, of Antwerp, who had consigned it to his correspondents in London. The chagrin of the clergy was extreme. No sooner had

* "D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation," vol. v, p. 297

they burned one copy of the New Testament than three more made their appearance. They accused the printer Eyndhoven at Antwerp, but their charges were contemptuously dismissed by the magistrates. The Gospel was beginning to free men from the Papal yoke, to restore the domination of just law, and to protect the inalienable liberties of human beings to do any thing and every thing that is in harmony with the revealed will of their Maker.

England was now ablaze with Gospel truth. The abominable wickednesses of Popery were now fully disclosed by its shining light. Tyndale, in his Belgic refuge, applied its teaching to the social and political life of the English people. He vigorously opposed the divorce of Henry VIII. from Catherine of Arragon, denounced the political interferences of the Papacy, and by the issuance of several controversial and devotional publications strove to enlighten and bless his fellow-citizens. Edition after edition of the New Testament, printed on the Continent, poured into England, and the very fury of the priests, who burned all the precious volumes on which they could lay their hands, only helped the work of the reformer by stimulating the desires of the people to possess them.

Cardinal Wolsey now bent all his energies to compass the death of Tyndale, who was repeatedly forced to change his residence. No powerful Duke of Lancaster, no illustrious Elector of Saxony came forward to shield him. Nevertheless, having completed the translation of the New Testament, he boldly began that of the Old. The learned John Fryth, escaped from the prisons of Oxford, diligently assisted him. In the early part of 1529 they published the Books of Genesis and Deuteronomy, and, in homely style, laid down one excellent principle of interpretation for all Bible students: "As thou readest," said they, "think that every syllable pertaineth to thine own self, and suck out the pith of Scripture."

Tyndale, in September, 1528, took up his abode at Marburg, on the Lahn, almost midway between Frankfort-am-Main and Cologne. There, in 1529, occurred the famous disputation between Luther, Zwingle, Melanchthon, and other reformers on the true nature and character of the Lord's Supper. Whether Tyndale were present at the memorable Marburg Conference is uncertain. Translation, rather than controversy, was his

pressing duty; and he and Fryth quietly pursued the pleasing task of rendering the Hebrew Scriptures into their own vigorous vernacular. They were safe while in the territories of the Landgrave Philip of Hesse, the dreaded opponent of Rome. Yet Tyndale did not shrink from controversy when providentially called to engage therein. In 1529 he proved himself to be more than a match as the champion of Scripture against Sir Thomas More, the cultured champion of the Church of Rome. Unable to silence him by literary argument, More and Tonstall grimly resolved to silence his pen by burning him at the stake.

To effect this deadly purpose Tonstall crossed the North Sea to Antwerp, whither Tyndale and Fryth had again repaired, after their residence in Marburg. All that the crafty bishop succeeded in doing was the purchase of all Tyndale's unsold Testaments, wherewith to celebrate a papal *auto da fé*. But the very money paid out to this end only enabled Tyndale to pay off his harassing debts, and to bring out a fresh and more correct edition of the New Testament. The wily and unscrupulous ecclesiastic overreached himself, and had the mortification of helping the man whom he yearned to stifle in the flames of martyrdom.

Dangers thickened around the courageous apostle. Placards posted at Antwerp announced that the Emperor Charles V. was about to prosecute—or rather persecute—all heretics and their writings. Antwerp is no longer safe for him. He decides to sail for Hamburg. Embarking with his books, his manuscripts, and the remainder of his money, he glides down the Scheldt into the German Ocean, is overtaken by a terrible storm, dashed upon the coast, and barely escapes with his life. Books, manuscripts, and money are all swallowed by the remorseless waves. "Deep calleth unto deep at the noise of thy waterspouts: all thy waves and thy billows go over me." But the hero trusts his God with faith sublime as that of Job, boards another vessel, sails up the well-known Elbe, and is once more in his Hamburg refuge.

Germano-Belgic Period, 1529–1534.

Joy waits for Tyndale at Hamburg. Miles Coverdale, afterward renowned as a translator of the Scriptures, is there on

purpose to assist him. The two friends lodge with the pious Margaret Van Emerson, and spend some time in congenial labor, undisturbed by the sweating sickness which is raging around them. Coverdale soon returned to England, and Tyndale was once more left alone.

But, though alone in a strange city, no man's power was more deeply felt by all England. His book, entitled "The Obedience of a Christian Man," and also his translation of "The Testament of Jesus Christ," had fallen into the hands of Queen Anne Boleyn, and had confirmed her in friendliness to the Reformation, and in antipathy to the Antichrist of Rome. "The Obedience of a Christian Man" fell into the hands of King Henry VIII., and captivated him by the soundness of its reasoning, and the vigor of its style. It also added intensity to his own opposition to the papacy; but he did not allow it to lead him into submission to the King of kings. About two years after this Henry sought to induce Tyndale to return to England, rightly thinking that he might render excellent service in the conflict with the papacy. But in vain did he offer the reformer a safe-conduct under the sign manual; in vain did he make the most gracious promises. Tyndale would not hearken. He had not thrown off the yoke of an ecclesiastical to put on that of a secular pope. Besides, Henry himself had opposed the circulation of the Scriptures, which the great Head of the Church had commanded to be circulated throughout the world. Tyndale profoundly mistrusted Henry Tudor, refused his invitation, and gave him some excellent advice. Henry was terribly exasperated, and thenceforth thought only how he could arrest and punish the expatriated servant of God for his faithfulness.

The importation of Testaments from Hamburg went on without effective interruption. They entered England by the ship-load. Enemies bought up and burned some, but still more became the cherished treasures of Christian families. Hitton was burned at the stake in 1530 for importing Testaments. In 1531 the bloodthirsty monster, Henry VIII., spilled the life-blood of Bilney, Bainham, Bayfield, Tewkesbury, and many others "of whom the world was not worthy."

Meanwhile, the multitude of Bible readers and believers had effected something like a Church organization, wholly

independent of Rome, under the name of "The Society of Christian Brethren." They established a central committee in London, and sent out missionaries who distributed the Holy Scriptures, and explained their doctrines in simple language. Several priests, both in city and country, belonged to this organization. Vain was the rage of man. In vain did kings "set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his Anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us." Psa. ii, 2, 3. The word of the Lord could not be bound. The waves of divine knowledge broke through every barrier, brought salvation to longing souls, swept away old iniquities and abuses, and caused England to rejoice and blossom as the garden of the Lord.

Even the English dogs caught the antipathy of their owners to the papacy. One of these, a spaniel with long silky hair, was taken by his master, the Earl of Wiltshire, and Henry's embassador to the Pope, to Rome in the year 1530. Pope Clement, clad in pontifical robes, seated in his throne, and surrounded by cardinals, received Wiltshire and his fellow-diplomats with great pomp. They approached, and made the usual salutations. Willing to show his kindly feelings, the Pontiff put out his slippered foot, in order that the proud Englishmen might kiss the cross embroidered thereon. This they disdainfully refused to do. The spaniel, which had followed his master into the episcopal palace, did more than decline. When the Pope extended his foot, the dog flew at it, caught it by the great toe, and held that sensitive member fast between his teeth. Clement hastily pulled his foot back again. The scene was too ridiculous. The embassadors were ready to burst with laughter, and hid their faces behind their long rich sleeves. "That dog was a Protestant," said a priest. "Whatever he was," replied an Englishman, "he taught us that a pope's foot was more meet to be bitten by dogs than kissed by Christian men." * The revolution of thought and feeling indicated by this singular spectacle was very largely the work of the isolated and persecuted translator.

Tyndale, whose hiding-place in the neighborhood of Antwerp was unknown to his malignant foes, continued to prosecute

* D'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation in the Time of Calvin," vol. iv, p. 25.

his great work of translating and publishing the Scriptures in English. In 1532 he was left alone by his colleague, John Fryth, who returned to England to scatter the Gospel there in person. Fryth fell into the hands of his mortal foe, Sir Thomas More, in the month of October, and in the following year was condemned to the flames. Tyndale wrote him from Antwerp not to fear "men that threat, nor trust men that speak fair. Your cause," said he, "is Christ's Gospel, a light that must be fed with the blood of faith." Fryth neither feared nor flinched. On the 4th of July he was burned at Smithfield—a sweet light shining on his face while he besought God to pardon his enemies.

Tyndale was living at Antwerp, a beloved guest in the house of Thomas Poyntz, a warm-hearted English merchant, when an English ship brought the tidings of his faithful colleague's martyrdom. Fryth's cruel fate foreshadowed his own, and caused him to redouble his zeal in the Master's service. He visited and relieved the poor, studied and preached with intense zeal, and labored unremittingly in his work of translating the Old Testament. "He is master of seven languages," remarked Busche, the disciple of Reuchlin, "Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, English, French; and so thoroughly that, whichever he is speaking, one might believe it to be his mother-tongue." * And yet Rome had no use for such a man, except to burn him. That, however, she could not do till his work was done. Four new editions of the New Testament issued from the Antwerp presses in 1534. Tyndale presented Queen Anne with a handsome copy of his New Testament, which she highly prized and profitably pondered to the hour of her death. Encouraged by her active friendliness, the adherents of the Gospel printed six more editions of the New Testament for sale in the English market. The flood that was to sweep the papal dominion away from English soil was becoming resistless. No efforts availed to stay the swelling torrent. To say that the Romish prelates hated Tyndale as the source of the deluge is not to do justice to the diabolic intensity of their malice. They longed and groaned for his blood, and compassed land and sea to spill it on the ground.

* D'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation in the Time of Calvin," vol. v, p. 31.

CROWNING PERIOD, 1534–1536.

The great translator's enemies were about to effect their nefarious designs. Chief among these foes was Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, the ecclesiastical Fouché of Henry VIII., and a Churchly Scotland Yard detective of the cunningest and most unscrupulous type. His instruments were like himself. Two of them were sent to Antwerp to destroy Tyndale. One was a specious hypocrite, named Phillips; the other a vicious and crafty monk, named Gabriel Dunne. Both received welcome entrance into the hospitable mansion of Thomas Poyntz. Tyndale, attracted by the conversation of Phillips, invited him into his library, showed him his books and manuscripts, conversed with him about his past and future labors, and the means at his command for circulating the Scriptures throughout England. The guileless Nathanael unbosomed himself to the insidious Judas. Phillips, acting under Dunne's instructions, went to Brussels, and concocted plans for the betrayal of his benefactor, Tyndale. Accompanied by the papal officers he returned to the house of Poyntz, who was absent from home, stationed them along the street and at the entrance of the alley leading to the house, and "gave them a sign." "I shall come out with Tyndale," said the new Iscariot, "and the man I point out with my finger is the one you will seize."

With these words he entered the house, complimented Tyndale, and by means of a base lie borrowed thirty pounds of him. Tyndale then invited Phillips to dine with him at the house of a friend. The covetous, miserable wretch gladly accepts. Together they start down the alley. Tyndale, who is of middle size, goes first at the urgent request of Phillips, who is very tall, and who walks with forefinger extended over his victim's head. The officers recognize the traitor's sign. Their hard hearts melt with pity for the simple, unsuspecting prey. They seize him, and conduct him to the house of the imperial prosecutor, who hastens to Tyndale's lodging, and carries off papers, books, and all that belonged to him. This booty, together with his prisoner, he places in a carriage, and drives off. A journey of three hours brings them to the strong castle of Vilvorde, two or three leagues from Brussels,

on the banks of the Senne, surrounded on all sides by water, and flanked by seven towers. The drawbridge is lowered, Tyndale is delivered to the governor, and placed in a safe place. Antichrist triumphs at last. Judas boasts of his exploit. Tyndale will not come out, except to die.

It is the month of August, 1535. The husbandmen are reaping the fruits of the earth in the fat and fruitful Belgium. England is reaping a richer harvest than that of Belgium. It is a harvest of spiritual blessings that spring from the prisoner's sowing. He himself will shortly reap the harvest of life eternal.

Tyndale in prison at Vilvorde is infinitely happier than his betrayer at the imperial court. His countrymen cannot save him. King Henry VIII. and the English prelates gloat over his capture; but he finds abundant consolations in Christ. His prison proves to be a palace—Jesus is with him there. His prison hours are employed in preparing for the humble toilers in his native county, and the counties adjoining, an edition of the Bible in which he used the language and orthography of that section of England. Thus he fulfilled the vow made many years before in the words: "If God preserves my life, I will cause a boy that driveth a plow to know more of the Scriptures than the Pope."

Two additional editions of Tyndale's New Testament appeared during the first year of his captivity. His publication of the Old Testament, translated from the Hebrew text, seemed to have been frustrated by the fiendish treachery of Phillips. But Rogers, who succeeded the martyred Fryth as Tyndale's colleague, had providentially rescued the manuscript of the Old Testament at the moment when Phillips effected the perfidious arrest. He afterward printed it in the great folio Bible, which was issued with such secrecy that it is not yet certainly known in what city it passed through the press. Hamburg, Antwerp, Marburg, Lübeck, and even Paris, have been named. Bonnet, the French bibliopole, affirms that it was printed by Froschover of Zurich. Certain it is that it was published. Then, when his life-work was done, the craft and malice of Rome were permitted to wreak their vengeance on the great translator. His was the joy of perfect and assured success.

Tyndale's last days were full of great peace and divine

sweetness. The jailer, his daughter, and other members of his household, were converted to Christ by the saintly prisoner's life and doctrine. His friends put forth the utmost exertion to save him, but without avail. In August, 1536, he was arraigned before the ecclesiastical court for having infringed the imperial decree forbidding any one to teach that faith alone justifies. The accusation was true, and Tyndale's doctrine was also true. The imperial decree was utterly antichristian and indefensible. Tyndale defended himself with such scriptural logic and touching eloquence as to win the minds and hearts of the court that tried him. "Truly," exclaimed the procurator-general, "truly this was a good, learned, and pious man!" But that was the very reason why the Romish priests, like the murderers of our Lord, thirsted for his blood.

Tyndale was declared guilty, was solemnly deprived of his clerical character, expelled from the Church of Rome, and delivered to the secular power for capital punishment. Can such things be possible on this beautiful earth? What a mystery of iniquity is Roman Catholicism! The secular authorities delayed his execution for two months. Full of faith, peace, and joy, he waited the hour when he should step into the chariot of fire, and ascend far up above all worlds to be forever with the Lord. "Well," said one who observed him closely at Vilvorde, "if that man is not a good Christian, we do not know of one upon earth."

Rome, "drunken with the blood of the saints," was bent on burning him. Friday, October 5, 1536, brought release from all sufferings. In the ripeness of his knowledge, love, and usefulness; his eye yet bright, and his natural strength not abated, William Tyndale passed, for the last time, beyond the outward walls, and halted without the fortifications. A crowd is gathered to witness his death. They behold not the punishment of a heretic, but the triumph of a martyr. Memory is vivid and accurate in this awful hour. But it is not of childhood days in the sunny fields and leafy woods of the Severn vale; not of student years at Oxford, nor of the heavenly light that there streamed into his soul through the pages of Erasmus' Greek Testament; not of pleasant conferences with fellow-heroes at Cambridge; not of the generous hospitalities

of Sodbury, nor of the sojourn at Hamburg, the flight from Cologne, the printing of the Gospel at Worms; not of the labors of Marburg, and the toils of Antwerp; not of the traitor Phillips, nor of the Vilvorde jail, that he thinks now. It is of the dissemination of the Bible in England, the rescue of his people from the slough of superstition and vice, and the glorious liberty of the children of God into which the written word should lead them. Henry Tudor barred the way. Of him the sufferer thinks, and for him he prays. While the executioner fastens him to the post, he cries in suppliant voice, "Lord, open the king of England's eyes!" Like his Lord, like the proto-martyr Stephen, his last prayer is for his murderers. Who shall say that that prayer was not answered? He is strangled, and then burned.

Scarcely had "the apostle of England in this our later age" —as John Foxe termed him—ascended to his celestial home, when Richard Grafton, the printer, went to London, presented Tyndale's Bible to Archbishop Cranmer, and begged him to procure its free circulation. Cranmer examined it, and was delighted with it. Fidelity, clearness, strength, simplicity, unction—all were combined in this admirable translation. He sent the book to Cromwell, "the hammer of the monks," and requested that statesman to present it to his Majesty, and to obtain permission for it to be sold, until such time as the bishops should put forth a better translation, which, he added, "I think will not be till a day after doomsday."

Henry ran over the book. Tyndale's name was not in it. The dedication to himself was well written. He saw that it would help him to emancipate England from papal thralldom, and unexpectedly came to a very astounding decision. *He authorized the sale and the reading of the Bible throughout the kingdom.* Verily, William Tyndale had not lived in vain.

The people received the Bible with enthusiasm. Those who knew its history saw that it was printed with the blood of the apostolic translator. All who could bought and read it; or had it read to them by others. Aged persons learned their letters in order to study its pages. Poor people clubbed their savings together, and purchased copies which they read by turns to the crowds around them. The fetters of popery fell from the limbs of England. Tyndale had prayed that he

might see it on fire by his Master's word, and from his throne in the new Jerusalem beheld the answer to his prayer. "Of the translation itself, though since that time it has been many times revised and altered, we may say that it is substantially the Bible with which we are all familiar. The peculiar genius—if such a word may be permitted—which breathes through it—the mingled tenderness and majesty, the Saxon simplicity, the preternatural grandeur, unequaled, unapproached, in the attempted improvements of modern scholars—all are here, and bear the impress of the mind of one man—William Tyndale." * All judicious critics are unanimous in praise of this immortal work.

Notices and biographies of the great translator are numerous. Tanner, Bliss, Wood, Foxe, Walter, Offor, Wordsworth, Dryden, Newcome, Johnson, Lewis, Cotton, Anderson, Townley, Horne, and many others have kept his memory green. A monument marks the spot on Nibley Knoll where he is supposed to have first seen the light.

The revision of the Authorized, or King James's, Version, of the Scriptures has recalled the memory and services of England's martyr-apostle, and suggested the idea of erecting a statue to his honor. A committee, with Lord Shaftesbury at its head, was formed for that purpose. A fine site on the Thames Embankment in London was obtained from the Metropolitan Board of Works. J. E. Boehm, a sculptor of the highest eminence, and famous for his statue of John Bunyan at Bedford, was requested to prepare a design for the work. Subscriptions to defray the estimated cost of $20,000 were invited from all lovers of the Bible. The clergy of the Established and Dissenting Churches; the universities, counties, towns, and societies of Great Britain; the clergy and laity of the British colonies, and of the United States, gladly poured in their contributions. The bronze statue, representing Tyndale in his doctor's robes, and holding an open New Testament in his right hand, is soon to be placed on its pedestal.

The fathers drove Tyndale out of the country with threats and curses; the sons eulogistically erect a monument in his praise. Noble and eloquent orations will accompany its inauguration. But that creation of art and love is not the principal

* Froude's "History of England," vol. iii, pp. 86, 87.

monument of the holy translator. The Bible itself is his chief remembrancer. His version of "God's Word written" laid deep and firm the foundation of England's greatness. Baptized with the blood of Fryth and Tyndale and Rogers, it laid the foundations of a new and greater England on the American shores of the wild Atlantic, and of other Englands in South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. In each and all it is the fountain of liberty, the guide of legislation, the guarantee of law, the glory of the Church, the strength of society, the comfort of the soul, the perennial principle of progress. Those great and growing commonwealths are component parts of one of the grandest monuments possible to the memory of man—a monument on which the instructed eye fails not to see, inscribed in letters of living light, the name of WILLIAM TYNDALE, THE FIRST TRANSLATOR OF THE HOLY BIBLE INTO THE PRINTED ENGLISH VERNACULAR.

ART. III.—BISHOP HURST'S BIBLIOTHECA THEOLOGICA.

Bibliotheca Theologica. A Select and Classified Bibliography of Theology and General Religious Literature. By JOHN F. HURST, LL.D. New York: Phillips & Hunt. 1883.

BIBLIOSOPHY is quite another thing from Bibliomania. The bibliosopher extracts wisdom from books, the bibliomaniac worships their bindings, even their deformities, knowing seldom more than the eccentricities and title-pages of his idols, sometimes not even that. "He know any thing about books!" exclaimed one of these victims of the *delirium librorum*, when told of the bibliographical attainments of a distinguished scholar; "Perhaps he may, of the insides of them!"

Nevertheless, the bibliosopher is sometimes a bibliographer too; he often knows books by heart *and* by title. Abundant in knowledge, he knows where more can be had; he can tell you what he knows, and also, what may prove more important, where he found it, where unworked beds of it lie yet undisturbed. Bishop Hurst, in giving us a list of titles, such as his "Bibliotheca Theologica" contains, has earned gratitude, if not glory. He has performed one of those services which, like

giving a cup of cold water, cannot lose its reward. Many a young man eager to become a master in some one department of theological literature will find in this book the beginnings of power, the suggestions for a comprehensive self-culture, which he might otherwise seek for years and, haply, not discover. For of the scores who are ready to advise him, not all are competent; he may run, as the German by-word goes, from Pontius to Pilate, receiving only confusion for all his seeking. But here is a classified list of all, or nearly all, the theological literature of any value in the English language. Let him devote himself to what topic he may, he need but turn over these pages to find what is necessary to start him in his studies.

The young minister who is beginning a library must not, however, fancy that the "Bibliotheca" is to be used as the rustic used his bill of fare, that he is to eat his way through from A to Z. On the contrary, he must begin a simultaneous construction of the four great departments of Theology: the Exegetical, the Historical, the Systematic, and the Practical. Bishop Hurst has done well to build his library upon so simple a ground-plan, four walls and an entrance hall, four great departments and an introduction, into which he gathers Bibliography, Lexicography, Cartography, and the so-called Libraries of Theology. The student, also, will do well to build his libraries, the one in his study and the one in his brain, upon a ground-plan equally simple. For each of these departments supports and is necessary to the other. Even exegesis, which, at first blush, might seem to be merely a question of linguistic knowledge and skill, is of little value when sundered from historical fact and from practical acquaintance with the diverse forms of spiritual life and society as displayed in different countries and epochs. What he shall buy is also quite a different question from what he shall read. Bacon's maxim is the final word upon this point. Some books are to be tasted and some are to be chewed. It has sometimes occurred to me that our itinerancy needs an itinerant's library to make it complete. It would require no great contribution from each of us to build up a conference library containing every book in the "Bibliotheca Theologica," and many more, some of which might circulate freely among the members of the conference, while others remained at some central point to be consulted by the brethren

as time permitted or necessity required. But such an arrangement is perhaps impracticable, and in any event there are many books which every man fit to preach at all does well to keep always within arm's length; and the intelligent user of Bishop Hurst's book should mark at once, in each of the great departments, these "indispensables." Certainly that is a foolish, not to say impertinent, criticism which I have somewhere seen, the pith of which is the truism that a list of books cannot be made so self-shrinking and self-intelligent that the would-be buyer needs but show his purse to have the list exhibit to him just what he ought to buy. For intelligent friends, though never found in shoals, are nevertheless discoverable to the earnest seeker; and, moreover, the first two pages of Bishop Hurst's "Bibliotheca" contains mention of more than one book which will help the beginner in theology to discriminate between the dispensables and the indispensables.

As one turns over the leaves of this volume, containing its 375 pages of mere book-titles—these, too, of works in a language not the most prolific in theological lore—one is fain to reflect upon the history of books, the history of creeds, the history of religious thought, or perhaps it is better to say, in view of some of these treatises, of thought about religion. What a long stride from Cadmus to Franklin, from hieroglyph to stereotype, from graver's tool to printing-press, from the parchments of Pisistratus to the vast treasures of the British Museum or the Boston Public Library!

Bibliography among the ancients involved no great labor, yet what has come down to us is scant and fragmentary. What would we not have given had the Alexandrian Library fallen into the hands of some indexing genius like Mr. Poole! Aristotle wrote a treatise upon books of which a few bits only yet remain, but any of "the thoughts that wander through eternity," whose first utterance was the splendid birthright of Hellenic genius, have been pieced together only after wearisome search from page to page and author to author. By such painstaking reconstruction Mullach has enabled us to stand face to face with the mutilated originals of Greek philosophy, the Elgin marbles of the ancient mind. Indeed, nearly all our knowledge of the scope and number of the literary labors of antiquity is due to modern scholars.

But the worker in these fields has one great advantage; production has ceased. Whereas bibliography, in an age of polyglot culture such as ours, is a task to break the spine of Hercules or Atlas. In our time every art has its literature, every profession its treatises, every city books about it as well as within it. We are inundated, overwhelmed, swept away with the flood which pours down from above and wells up from beneath. The pursuit of a specialty is but a form of self-protection, like climbing a mountain to escape a deluge. Nay-even the literature of the specialties is carrying all but the strongest swimmers from their course. Take, for example, Vaihinger's recently published commentary upon Kant. To master the literature there heaped up about a single name is enough to occupy the entire life of a more than ordinary man. For this reason, not to speak of other weighty ones, the future of bibliography must run more and more to monographs. A dictionary of all books is sheer impossible. Even Ebert saw, sixty years ago, the uselessness of any attempt to record the title of all books ever published, and marked out clearly the lines in which the study has since been moving; and we need not bemoan this inevitable abandonment of an enterprise far more ambitious than useful. Bibliography will return to its starting-point of single lists with chastened and clearer mind. It will become auxiliary to science and to literature, surrendering its haughty pretensions to be a science in itself. Certainly we would all have been grateful enough to the Alexandrian grammarian, who arranged the dialogues of Plato, had he also made out for us a catalogue of all the books which in after years were consumed by Omar's fiery logic. But the list of titles, however interesting, without the books, could have served us naught or little; whereas the preservation of Plato has affected the structure of the Aryan mind. I am well aware of Henry Stevens's pregnant saying that the bibliographer must be no respecter of books, not knowing which is destined to immortality. The despised pamphlet of to-day may in the course of centuries become a priceless literary or historical treasure. All of which is true enough, and worthy to be bound upon the frontlets of every librarian in the land. Yet few of us do well to project ourselves so far into the future, or to gloat through our descendants' eyes over the literary trash

which time shall have converted into literary treasure. Our work is for to-day. It must be done between sun-up and sun-down. The book-list we need must bear upon the topic in hand. We have neither patience for waiting, nor strength or wisdom for searching. Happy is the worker among books who has learned to know and use these lists. While other men are ransacking volumes to find a fact or precedent, he cuts straight to the spot. I have seen men waste hours, and even days, searching for what a little skill in bibliography would have given them in a few moments, they being too proud to ask for help, and, in this particular, too ignorant to help themselves.

But, though bibliography will gain rather than lose by this return to its starting-point, such magnificent work as that of Brunet must always excite our admiration. It could have been produced only in a country where the making of books, no matter what their kind, is a work of fine art. The Englishman's sense of the practical, the German's love of moling among the roots of things, make the kind of enthusiasm impossible which is required when the biography of a book is to be studied as though it were a living thing. But the French founder of the science of bibliography seems to have been born to emphasize through seven huge volumes Milton's splendid saying, "Many a man lives a burden to the earth; but a good book is the precious life-blood of a master-spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life." The evident delight with which he dwells upon details which would escape all but the fondest lover would provoke a smile could the sense of wonder for a moment abate. Yet Ebert, whose valuable bibliographical dictionary is one of the very few omissions in Bishop Hurst's book worth noting, has ventured to call the bibliography of Brunet restricted bibliography, and to contrast it with what he boldly terms bibliography pure. The German librarian's point of view is, however, the only one adapted to the Teutonic eye. He must get to the "grund," to the very core and heart of the matter, to the thing in itself, to the book in itself, stripped of its accidents and history.

English bibliography has been essentially practical; helpful to the book buyer and book seller, helpful also to the book reader and book writer.

Now scratch an American and you find an Englishman. So, although our American bibliography has a bigness and a boldness quite Western, it is essentially English in its spirit. What stronger proof of this could we have than the appearance in one year of Poole's "Index," Soule's "Lawyer's Reference Manual," and Bishop Hurst's "Bibliotheca Theologica?" Each of these is thoroughly practical in aim and execution, and the publication of the latter two has brought the practitioners of law and theology somewhere near the bibliographical level of the medical profession, who already possessed an inestimable treasure in the catalogue of the splendid library in the Surgeon-General's office at Washington.

I have already spoken of the simplicity of the ground-plan upon which Bishop Hurst has built; but I am not so sure that I can praise the very numerous subdivisions he has thought best to make. Nor am I altogether satisfied with his admission of books into his list, which, however valuable to the theological student, are hardly theological in purpose or in substance. Kant's remark that the frontiers of the sciences must never overlap is especially binding upon the bibliographer. To neglect it opens the door to caprice; the exclusions are hard to explain upon any principle that does not banish many of those included. On what principle, for instance, admit Mrs. Oliphant's "Makers of Florence" and exclude the far more important works of Burckhardt and of Symonds? What right has Herbert Spencer to a place which cannot be claimed with more of justice for David Hume? But these, if they be failings at all, are failings that lean to virtue's side. More serious are some omissions, of which I might name Locke's "Essay upon Toleration," Laing's edition of the "Complete Works of John Knox," and Lorimer's "John Knox and the Church of England." The yet uncompleted "Thesaurus Syraicus," edited by Payne Smith, should hardly have been passed over. In the list pertaining to the ecclesiastical history of the United States I miss especially Morgan Edwards's "History of the Baptists," a work as valuable as it is rare. The Librarian of Pennsylvania may be pardoned for regretting that he finds no mention of the Mennonites, and the very conspicuous absence of the "Religious Works of William Penn!" To one who loves him, the non-appearance of the Venerable Bede seems like a failure to invite a dear and

honored friend. Montalembert's "Monks of the West," which has here rightly found a place, is a charming book, I know, but it can never supersede (what book could?) the "Ecclesiastical History of England," a translation of which is one of Bohn's Antiquarian Library. And speaking of Montalembert reminds me that Augustin Thierry's "Stories of the Merovingian Times" is nothing more than a splendid rendering of the chronicle of Bishop Gregory of Tours, and should by all means have a place under the rubric France.

But enough of this. The student of theology can hardly turn over this patiently wrought-out table of contents and not awake to the magnitude and dignity of his chosen pursuit. Especially is this true of the departments of Historical and Systematic Theology. The former is the study of human aspiration in both its phases, intellectual and spiritual; the study of the mind in its struggle with falsehood and error; of conscience in its desperate fight with passions inward and outward born; the study of the lives of the chosen few who have risked their all of existence and of hope in the conflict with steel-clad prejudice, with the engineries of organized tradition impatient of light and liberty, or with the tumult of licentious mobs whose unsated and insatiable fury is worse than hail or pestilence or earthquake. Who, on the one hand, can trace the history of doctrines from the *Pistis Sophia* to the New Haven Theology, from Marcion to Newman Smyth, without a touch of sadness to sickly o'er his consciousness of dearly purchased liberty of opinion? Who, on the other hand, does not thrill at the suggestions of names like Bohemia, Waldenses, Moravians, Lollards, Jansenists, Jesuits? What a shrunken thing were human history without the story of man's struggle to break his way toward the light! What a shrunken thing were the human soul, its aspirations for the truth once gone! A burnt out volcano, discarded wrapping of a heart of fire! A waste of sand, hot, stifling, destitute of plant or flower, where once the blue waters reflected the sky and stars!

I cannot sympathize with those who think to make men wise in the truth by keeping them in ignorance of every form of error. Indeed, the perennial heresies—those which originate, as it were, by spontaneous combustion in every generation—originate either among the ignorant or the learned-ignorant.

Many a man rushes forward in these days with a discovery which scholars know to be as old as Celsus; others float into notice upon craft built for all the world like Spinoza's neglected treatise upon the Old Testament, sublimely unconscious how little there is of newness in the model of their ship. But the study of Error is one form of the study of Truth. It is in the study of human thought, what morbid physiology is in the study of the human body. It cannot secure us against disease, but it may help us cure it; it can make us kindlier toward the erring; it may make us careful of our own feet, lest we, too, go astray.

Then, again, in these days of inductive science, we are seeing very clearly that only by comparison can we arrive at causes and measure their respective potencies. Each historical epoch, each genesis of doctrine, is a problem to be solved. Each individual display of grace or power challenges us to discover the reason of its being. If we are ever to know the practical value of Christianity, if we are ever to know just what elements in it have been most effective, we must study it as one of the producing causes of modern institutions, modern societies, modern men. The careless *post hoc propter hoc* method so much in vogue must be abandoned for one more conclusive because more scientific. But in that case we shall need knowledge and more knowledge. We shall have to learn to add algebraically as well as arithmetically, to strike a balance between opposing tendencies, not in one group of historical phenomena only, but in scores and hundreds. The *quod est demonstrandum* which is so often shouted nowadays by those "who think to bear it by being peremptory," will make but little impression unless we are expert in all the facts and methods needful to sustain it. Until then, the plainly told experience of the humblest convert will be more effective to demonstrate the value of Christian faith than any rhetorical outgush of undigested historical generalization. That is a dwarfed and stunted theologian who knows doctrines in their verbal statement only, but nothing of their inception and their growth; that is a sounding brass and tinkling symbol who is forever prating of the value of Christianity to the human race, yet takes no pains to discover precisely what the world was over which Christianity began to flow, or the successive changes which this

new encircling of our planet with light and warmth has induced upon its surface.

Of Systematic Theology it is difficult to speak. What names confront us here! Augustine, Calvin, Thomas Aquinas, the Angelic Doctor; Anselm, the conqueror's conqueror; Butler, Dorner, Naville, Bushnell! What topics, too, are here! God and the Universe; Necessity and Liberty; Christ and the Resurrection; Atheism, with its skeleton front; Skepticism, with its hopeless eyes; Pantheism, with its vague sublimity; Agnosticism, with its haughty *non possumus;* Evolution, unbuilding and rebuilding in thought the universe of fact; Dogmatic Science and Scientific Dogma, now approaching, now repelling, each the other, from the days when Tertullian poured out his passionate protests against the alliance of the Gospel of Christ with the philosophy of Greece. Brave old Tertullian, with his heart of fire and his throat of steel—how gladly would I welcome him to a modern college, with its faculty of Christian teachers, or to a theological seminary, with its corps of specialists!

How gladly would I hear his clamor and his protest! One may be disposed to call him a Barbarian, as Ritter called Tatian, but his barbarism was like that of Luther, the outbreak of a healthy nature which feared for the robust life of the young Christianity in an atmosphere laden to stifling with Grecian subtleties and Epicurean sweetness. How healthy that instinct was the whole subsequent scholastic period is a witness. Christian doctrine during its continuance was so overlaid with philosophic embroideries of every sort that the seamless garment of Christ became a Joseph's coat of many colors; simplicity gave place to subtlety; the words of Christ were lost in the jargon of disputation. That the doctrine of justification by faith had to be re-discovered by Martin Luther can only be accounted for by studying the drift which the theologic mind had taken in the centuries between Tertullian and the Reformation. The Greek poison had done its work; love of truth had been swallowed up in the love of intellectual cunning. On the intellectual side Luther's revolt was against the Thomists and their philosophical messiah, Aristotle, who had supplanted Christ and Paul, just as on the political and ecclesiastical side it was a revolt against the supremacy of the

Pope, who, as vicar of Christ, was trying to supplant both earthly and heavenly authority. Tertullian and Luther went too far, for theology cannot absolutely dispense with philosophy. To repel attacks which in their very nature imply a system of metaphysics, materialistic, pantheistic, atheistic, is a task from which theology will not soon escape. But attempts to substitute metaphysical for historical foundations, to build up a theology upon a speculative basis, in the present state of our knowledge, resemble the attempt to build a castle upon a shifting shore, castle and builders alike are apt to be tumbled headlong into the sea. Yet this desire to eliminate as much as possible the metaphysical element from our systematic theology, and to remand what remains to its proper place, implies neither a disinclination to have the truths of revelation worked up into a coherent and logical system, nor a refusal to accept the psychology and metaphysics which such a system may clearly require. To object to systematic theology would be quite as absurd as to object to systematic physics or systematic botany or systematic geology. God gives us facts, and we must make our systems in every department of investigation. But just as Copernicus studied the planets rather than the astronomies of his time; just as Galileo abandoned Aristotle, and sought knowledge of the inclined plane and the telescope; just as Newton reasoned from falling apple to falling moon, and from breaking spectrum to compound light, so the master of systematic theology must return to the truth as revealed in Jesus, in Moses, in Paul, in John. Our theology must be drawn from the facts of the Bible and from the facts of personal experience, not read *into* and reasoned *into* both. Tertullian's *Credo quia absurdum est*, while seeming to shut the door upon all philosophy, has been the frantic expostulation of every metaphysical devil, which a clearer knowledge of the truth in Jesus has tried to expel from the contorted body of his bride. On the other hand, Anselm's *Credo ut intelligam* has been often mutilated into *Credo ut intelligo*. Instead of the belief shaping the understanding, the understanding has shaped belief. Texts have been torn from context, emptied of their meaning, or tortured to express a false one; the part has been made greater than the whole, the letter greater than the spirit, in order to sustain hypotheses that never had any higher

warrant than human speculation, often none higher than human caprice and human passion. Anselm's own *Cur Deus Homo* is a striking example of this tendency; he seems himself to have been so far conscious of his departure from the Augustinian *credimus ut cognoscamus* as to change his maxim into *intellige ut credas*, to which I have no objection as a rule for private guidance, but upon which I declare eternal war when another's *intelligo* is used by him to maim and cripple my belief. I confess, therefore, that in looking over Bishop Hurst's book I have at times wished that he had grouped together somewhere by themselves all the doctrinal topics of the New Testament, and ranged around them the treatises written for their elucidation, or that he had divided Doctrinal Theology into Expository, Apologetical, and Controversial. But for purposes of daily use his arrangement is far more convenient; and although it jars upon my sense of fitness to find "The Incarnation" immediately followed by "Infidelity," still I remember that dictionaries and works of reference must sacrifice logical forms to the demands of constant use. Here, as in most things, we are dominated by the needs of the present. In spite of Copernicus and Galileo, the sun still rises and sets in the almanacs of science, as well as in the speech and to the senses of the vulgar. The maker of a bibliography may well plead in his favor a law so powerful.

The exegetical section of Bishop Hurst's book, which has been built up with loving care, reveals, as hardly any thing else could, the amazing change in the spirit of exegesis which has taken place in the last three centuries. Few, indeed, are the Christian thinkers of any school who would now deal with Scripture as Calvin did. Texts are no longer bits of glass in exegetical kaleidoscopes, to be turned and shifted into all possible combinations, each of which is divinely ordered. The mind of the writer is now regarded as the mirror of the spirit. As no one would think of studying light without studying the nature of the eye, so no one expects to-day to understand the Father of Lights without a careful study of the organ of revelation. All that in any way can help us to such an understanding—local geography, current tradition, ethnological peculiarities, prevalent modes of thought and of speech, political conditions and aspirations, chronological color, and

historical development—are eagerly sought after and seized upon to help us in our efforts. Certainly there is much danger of pedantry here, and of that vermicular erudition which surprises more than it illuminates. Folly is a perennial and ubiquitous crop; but the erudite species of it is perhaps as harmless as any other. Exegesis, to be of marked value, must of course be mixed with brains. But unless we are all wrong about the Bible, such brain-mixed exegesis can never be overdone.

To Martin Luther, especially, we are indebted for the informing spirit of modern exegesis. No one can look through his letters, or read the "Table-talk," without being struck and moved by his attitude toward the Bible. He threw himself upon it to wrestle for its meaning. The cry of Jacob was on his lips: "Tell me thy name! thy nature thou!" The whole of its secret was not disclosed to him, nor has it been to any man. Like the great Being from whom it came, it permits the seeker of its glory to see only the trailing garments of its splendor, the cloud, the blaze, the movement of the spirit. As with Moses, so with him, the very darkness that covers him may be the hiding hand of God, who even in the outbursts of his grandeur preserves a strict economy, and by successive glimpses of his power strengthens his children to at last behold his face.

But though Luther's mental attitude toward the Bible was so frank, so unaffected, and in some respects so bold, how different were his surroundings from those of the modern student! What original texts are at our service! What advances have been made in the knowledge of ancient tongues! To what minuteness of detail have we carried our knowledge of ancient lands and ancient peoples! Could any one have told the Ritter George as he worked away in his room in the Wartburg, sore pressed by his own obtuseness and the cunning of the devil, how in after years the texts of manuscripts would be compared, how even the learning of Erasmus and of his own dear Philip would seem but trifling in an age of Tischendorff, of Ewald, of Tregelles, of Jelf, of Ellicott, of Westcott; could any one have told him what Lepsius and Wilkinson would write of Egypt, what Stanley would write of Sinai and of Palestine, his heart would have turned to water, and his untranslated Bible grown moldy from his tears. "Who am I," he would have cried, "to attempt this mighty work?" "What

need has God of bunglers?" But Jehovah placed him in a cleft of the rock, and covered him with his hand, as he passed by. The future was hidden from him, for had he beheld it, we would have beheld it not! "I will cause that the boy that followeth the plow shall know more of the Scriptures than thou dost!" said Tyndale to the ignorant priest. Brave Tyndale of the Christ-like heart! what wouldst thou say, wert thou living now? God has indeed "provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be perfect."

But I must not forget that the work of Bishop Hurst is confined chiefly to the books which are to be found in our mother-tongue, excepting some few great works in Latin which could hardly be omitted. Yet in looking over the list of translations we must be struck, I think, by the potency of French influence upon our theological development, a fact too apt to be neglected. Calvin, Pascal, Fénelon, our own John Flechière, Chateaubriand, Lammenais, Lacordaire, Montalembert have affected us in a positive direction far more than Voltaire or Rénan in a negative.

We Americans, not living, as our English cousins do, within a day's ride of the heart of France, are quite unconscious of the currents of Gallic influence which are a part of England's intellectual atmosphere. But we need only to think of Calvin's relation to Knox, of Fletcher's relation to Wesley, of the theological and social reaction which found its literary exponent in Joseph De Maistre, and its ecclesiastical champions in Henry Manning and John Henry Newman, to become aware that even our spiritual existence is shaped, or at least colored, by all that reaches England from across the channel.

On the other hand, the absence of all but a few Italian and Spanish names tells a story that needs no comment. The land of Da Vinci and of Galileo has produced in modern times a Galvani, a Secchi, a Cavour, but no second Anselm, no second Thomas of Aquino, no second Savonarola, not even a second Hildebrand. Theological greatness in Spain centered in Loyola and Suarez until Mr. Shorthouse discovered Molinos for us. But in the book before us, Loyola appears only by the portentous shadow which he throws; a shadow not unmixed with light, as every student of Jesuit missions in America must willingly confess.

But of German influence upon English theology it is not so easy to speak. It is apparently very great, but there is such a thing as mistaking sympathy for influence, likeness of mental and spiritual structure for discipleship and pupilage. German influence upon English theology began with the appearance of Erasmus in England, for though from Rotterdam he was essentially a German. It ceased almost entirely with the revolt in the Netherlands and the Thirty Years' War, not to be resumed until the present century, except in the one marked case of the Moravians and Wesley. But a hundred years ago the Germans had answered the French sneer, "Can a Teuton have genius?" by a manifestation of intellectual powers as wonderful as they were various. Kant shook the old dogmatic metaphysics from its foundation, and gave materialism a blow from which it never has, and never can, recover. Herder entered into history like a creative spirit, and chaos began to take on shape. Poets like Schiller revealed a critical faculty of the highest order. Goethe made poetry into science, and science into poetry. Lessing carried criticism to perfection in his "Laoccoon," and yet wrote dramas that still survive. These Germans threw themselves upon nature and upon tradition with an impetuosity and passion seldom, if ever, witnessed. They demanded of the universe its secrets, and of every existing institution its warrant of existence. One is reminded by the fierceness of their ardor of the oldest story about the Teutons recorded in any literature: how when the sea began to rage, the Scythians, arming themselves with helmet, shield, and spear, rushed upon the foaming billows and sought to beat them into calm. But, fortunately for Germany, fortunately perhaps for mankind, the constructive passion has proved greater than the destructive; the poetic, the creative faculty, mightier than the critical. The Germany that gave us Strauss has given us a Dorner also; the Germany that gave us Baur has given us an Ewald; the Germany that gave us Niebuhr has given us a Bunsen, a Curtius, and a Waitz.

Now, the influence of this movement upon England and the entire world is too patent and too potent to deny, or even to discuss. But I am nevertheless inclined to think of it as Milton thought of German influence upon the English Reformation. So far as the influence is a healthy one, it has simply

quickened into fresh activity a spirit essentially English. Be the modern Angle unmixed Teuton, or Teuton tempered, etherealized by Celtic fire, he is clearly nearer of kin to the modern German than he is to Frenchmen or to Irishmen. If he has not taken the same road of his own accord it is rather because of disturbing influences than from lack of original impulse. This is true of English life in general, and it is also true of English theology in particular. From the days of Cuthbert and of Bede to the days of Wesley and of Butler, that theology was marked by the same great characteristics, of sincerity, of boldness, of intelligent inquiry, of unconquerable devotion to the liberty of prophesying and the search for truth. Nor can I see that after a century of commingling with German thought these characteristics have been greatly modified. The original tendencies may have been quickened; some tendencies acquired from non-Germanic sources may have lost their hold; some few new ones may have been acquired. So much, but no more. The land whose first great burst of song but paraphrased the Book of Genesis, and which could call around her first poet, Cædmon, such kingly spirits as Bede and Wiclif and Tyndale, to bear him company in his rendering of God's word, had certainly the exegetical impulse in full measure from the start. Latimer and Bunyan—nay, even Francis Bacon—reveal a sympathy with the mind of the spirit which Luther in his happiest moments never surpassed. There is a breadth and majesty in Hooker's handling of the Scripture which at times approaches even the methods of the Master himself, in his sublime treatment of Old Testament revelation. Nor has German erudition to any extent affected this fundamental character of our English exegesis. Our men of science have not yet learned to "botanize upon their mothers' graves;" our biblical scholars have not yet come to value the gospels of our Lord solely as frames upon which to hang their learning, or upon which to display a perverse ingenuity.

In like manner the home of Roger Bacon has never lacked its mighty thinkers whose eyes could search the lands and seas, as well as gaze upon the far-off stars. With what easy mastery Butler rises to the height of his great argument! With what limpid clearness Paley sets before us truths whose very transparency at once reveals and conceals their depth! Turgidity

of phrase for its own sake, the affectation of learning or of science, was as far from these men as it was from Wesley in his preaching. The fogs which settled down upon their island home seem to have created in them a passion for an unclouded intellectual sky. If under the influence of Coleridge a certain nebulosity has come to pervade English theology; if English definiteness and positiveness have been to some extent lost by the immersion of English thinkers in German speculation; at any rate, the old passion for lucidity is not exhausted, the old power of exact expression is not utterly crippled, the old faculty of straightforward and consecutive thinking still survives, and will soon assert themselves in all their native vigor. Then, again, that longing to express the unutterable, to break the bounds of common logic, and scale the heavens by the strength of impulses born and nourished within the soul, is quite as much English as it is German. "The sparrow flies in at one door, and tarries for a moment in the light and heat of the hearth-fire, and then, flying forth from the other, vanishes into the wintry darkness whence it came. So tarries for a moment the life of man in our sight; but what is before it, what after it, we know not. If this new teaching tell us aught certainly of these, let us follow it." Such were the words with which the Northumbrian sage addressed King Eadwine when his wise men came about him to consider of the new faith. These words might well be accepted as descriptive of the spirit which has pervaded the purer minds of England from the beginning: a spirit which showed itself in Hooker, in More, in Fox, in Bunyan, in Baxter, in Wesley, and in poor broken-hearted Irving. The English, too, have vast capacities for faith and despair; neither the one nor the other is due to the influence of German theology or German philosophy in later times.

Nor can I wholly agree with those who trace the Christological tendencies of recent English theology to German sources. It is true that the appearance of Strauss's "Life of Jesus" made men keenly alive to what was really the heart of their faith. But this feeling that a mortal blow had been at last attempted was due to an instinct which has quickened the utterances of every great English preacher from Bede to Wesley; an instinct which led Milton to make the temptation of

Christ the whole argument of "Paradise Regained," which inspired the subtle verse of George Herbert, the touching strains of William Cowper, and at last kindled in the soul of Charles Wesley the raptures which sung themselves in lyrics "that are not for an age, but for all time." Others may say that the writings of Schleiermacher, Dorner, Ullman, have directly and indirectly transformed a mere feeling of English Christianity into an abiding intelligence, a mere instinct into a rational consciousness. Certainly more than this cannot be claimed; to me, even this seems more than should be conceded.

But it is time to end these desultory reflections. Yet I cannot do so without thanking Bishop Hurst for the catholicity which is every-where present in his work. He might have produced a bigger and yet a much narrower book. Though he terms it a "Selected Bibliography," the selections are those of one who contemplates the shock of opinions with that serenity which belongs to the full assurance of faith. Such tranquillity is the only frame of mind that becomes the Christian thinker, but it is not given to all of us, nor to any of us at all times.

In our gloomier moments, as we look out upon the crash of human forces and the collision of systems, tumbling against each other like the billows of an angry sea, only to take on new shape and shatter themselves again, rushing no whither and every whither, we are tempted to believe ourselves upon a shoreless ocean, whose distant horizon must fade away at last into a starless, endless night. But the Spirit of God is upon the face of the waters, to divide them into the sea and into the rain. Their very turbulence is a witness of his presence; the winds that sweep across them are messengers of his to do his will. When Theology and Philosophy shall become vast pools of stagnant and rotting traditions, then, indeed, we may have peace, but it will be the peace of pestilence, of intellectual and spiritual death.

Art. IV.—AGNOSTICISM.

Unbelief is as fond of new names as the unclean spirit was of the swept and garnished house. To a threadbare system a new name is a precious boon; it hides the old blemishes, it promises fresh revelations, it secures a new hearing. From time to time there have arisen many self-confessed pantheists, deists, atheists. To-day a genuine representative of either of these classes is almost a *rara avis*. Even avowed materialists and positivists are ominously scarce. For the time being, the opponents of theism prefer to affect the title of "agnostics." The word itself is not older than the year 1876, being, if the writer mistakes not, the cunning invention of Leslie Stephen, a fellow of Cambridge; but the system, if such it can be called, is not newer than Locke and Hume; than Hobbes and the Baconian theory; than the Greek root from which it was fashioned; than the immemorial attitudes of the human mind. "Waiter," said the newly elected member of a petty bench, "call me 'Judge,' and call it loud." Our contemporary gainsayer likes his new cognomen, and likes to have us call it loud.

Agnosticism, then. What does the new term stand for? Specifically, it stands for the venerable theory that the human mind can neither know nor conceive realities existing outside of the sphere of sense. It takes the position of neither affirming nor denying the existence of God, on the assumption that divine existence is necessarily unknowable. It declares, indeed, that the fundamental axiom of divine being, namely, self-existence, is unthinkable. The mind's primal and universal intuition of a First Cause is suicidal to thought, for, according to Herbert Spencer, "If we admit that there can be something uncaused, there is no reason to assume a cause for any thing." "The conception of the Absolute and Infinite, from whatever side we view it," says he, quoting Mansell, "appears encompassed with contradictions." There *may* be Intelligence and Volition in the world, but he maintains he is forever incapacitated for seeing them. Mind may feel after, but never can find, God. It may build altars and burn incense to the Unknown God, but may never rise to the certainty of declaring him to man.

The new name, all must admit, is prepossessing. It is no iron ding-dong of braggart denial, but a silvery and engaging sound stealing down from what is apparently no mean altitude of thought. There is reason to believe that already it has gone out through pretty much all the earth, and has been received with favor every-where by those who do not like to retain God in their knowledge. Indeed, it bears on its face a subtle plausibility fitted to conciliate and deceive the very elect. For, at first blush, agnosticism seems to admit the existence of a God. Its "perhaps" has the look of an encouraging concession. Perhaps, says our agnostic, there may be over yonder across the gulf, or even here at hand, a God as intelligent, holy, benevolent, philanthropic, as hath entered into the heart of faith. The liberality of such a concession, however, is about equal to that of one who beams good cheer on a beggar and sends him on his way to find Captain Kidd's money. Magnificent treasure, no doubt, if one could get at it; real treasure, too, though far away; a treasure not undemonstrably under the pavement of this very city! A feast, after the Barmacide order.

The new name, moreover, gives its owner a show of deeper wisdom in his generation than the atheist possessed. The fundamental principle of the atheist involved him in the most palpable absurdity. It assumed that, having made the round of the universe, having fathomed all conceivable and inconceivable possibilities, he was prepared to report the impossibility of a divine existence. A prodigious assumption, which began by saying there is no God, only to end by making the theorist himself a god! The agnostic affects an intellectual meekness quite in contrast with all this. He has the manner of one whose increase of information has made him aware how small the sum of his own knowledge is. "Cautious science" has taught him humility. He does not shake his fist skyward, but extends his open palm thither. He recognizes the mystery of existence. He seems to even re-enforce a certain doctrine of the very Scriptures, whose familiarity with the Unknowable must often shock him. He is fond of reiterating the challenge of Job, "Canst thou by searching find out the Almighty to perfection?" He quotes with approval the saying of Paul, "Dwelling in light which no man can

approach unto." He finds a forcible statement of his hypothesis in the declaration of Isaiah, "Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself."

Much of the plausibility of the agnostic's assumption, doubtless, lurks in its new Greek name. Thrust upon us suddenly, and with an air of candor, the glittering coin appears at first glance altogether worthy reception and currency. A little careful examination, however, betrays the art of the plater. Agnosticism involves necessary conclusions quite as fatal and absurd as any that belong to the branded and rejected deism, or pantheism, or atheism, of past generations.

1. Agnosticism is practical atheism.

The agnostic's universe is actually as empty of God as the atheist's. For, if God have an existence, he must avoid all the ordinary modes of existence. He must, indeed, be careful to so create and to so control the world as not to exhibit intelligence. He must descend to the level of David before Achish and simulate non-intelligence. Let the earth grow never so corrupt and full of violence, he must never betray existence by retributive and penal providences. The Power Not Ourselves must never make for righteousness, lest some sharp-eyed watcher catch a glimpse of the divine glory and joyfully reveal the Promethean secret to men. The agnostic Deity must in some anonymous way cure the human conscience of its universal habit of figuring to itself a Righteous Governor who sides with oppressed virtue and avenges transgression. Man's intuitions must be stifled, or they will filch the secret of divine existence, and keep parallel with the literal truth. Man must be kept from dreaming these startling realistic dreams about eternal life, for there is great danger that he will by means of them live as though he actually knew there were a God.

Practical atheism! For what is this affirming that God will never make himself known in creation, providence, retribution, moral inspiration, and intuition, but a new-fangled way of saying that there is no God at all? Verily, the hands are the hands of an agnostic, but the voice is the voice of an atheist. A God that never thinks, never acts, that has no moral affections—what is that but a nonentity? Putting the treasure at the foot of the rainbow—what is that but a poetical method of saying the rainbow has no foot? A God who does not

think, who makes no moral distinctions, who will not punish or reward men—how far removed is he from the no-God-at-all of the atheist? The most naïve and outspoken agnostics have acknowledged, indeed, that agnosticism really amounts to the annihilation of the divine existence. "We have seen," writes one of them, "the spring sun shine out of an empty heaven to light up a soulless earth; we have felt with utter loneliness that the Great Companion is dead." Now, a being that is dead, and always has been, is, in plain English, a being without existence. Let us understand, then, that though the Lorelei is singing a new song in the upper air, the jagged reefs and watery deeps lurk as of old below.

If agnosticism involves all the chilly and revolting consequences of atheism, no more does it escape the grotesque cosmogony of that system. The agnostic must face the same dilemma as the atheist: the world came either from God or from chance. He dare not admit that it was made by his unknowable God, for that would make him knowable to an alarming degree. The God-made heavens would betake themselves to telling his glory. Nor has he the hardihood to adopt the theory of the fortuitous concourse of atoms. The word "evolution" is his god-send, as the theist would say. But the broken and hand-piercing staff is not good to lean upon. The word describes not the origin of things, but their process. I ask a blind man just arrived at my door from a distant city who led him hither. He betakes himself to naming streets, highways, paths, crossings, lanes; he goes on calling off landmarks, sign-boards, finger-posts, historic trees, town pumps, hamlets, villages, cities. "My good man," I break in, "these things could never have brought you hither—whose hand was it that slipped out of yours at my gate?" So the agnostic, striving to eliminate God from his own processes, seizes on the names of certain methods and fashions of operation, which he names laws with especial reverence. These are only the avenues along which matter has been conducted hither. The unanswered question is, Who conducted it hither?

2. The agnostic is inconsistent with his own principles.

Touching matters beyond the realm of sense perception, he professes to affirm nothing. Of the phenomena of matter, he knows much; of God, he can know nothing. Now, the

assertion that we can know nothing about God is far more than an assumption concerning the limits of human perception. It is a tremendous assumption concerning the divine possibilities of self-revelation. It may be admitted that the denizens of a South American ant-hill can hardly send hither an expedition on a voyage of discovery, and go back reporting that such a person as I exists. But, if I choose, may I not make a voyage of revelation, let my shadow fall upon them, feed them, defend them, and though unable to unvail the total contents of my nature to them, could I not reveal to them altogether reliably the fact that I exist? The agnostic's language is far meeker than his theory. His theory knows a good many important things about the unknowable God. Somehow or other it has ascertained that he that formed the ear cannot hear, that he that made the tongue cannot communicate. By some means the agnostic has learned that he who has so marvelously and gloriously hung system on system in everlasting equilibrium, who has inspired ten thousand dialects, is yet powerless to invent the vaguest code of signals to flash across the abyss some trustworthy gleams of himself. The agnostic has gone outside and looked at man, and found him woefully sightless, deaf, and dumb. He has looked at God, taken account of his skill, and discovered that communication is out of the question. Laura Bridgman had her Dr. Howe to find the secret wicket-gate of the imprisoned soul and put it in communion with himself and all the world. But this Almighty of the agnostic can find no needle's eye in the blank walls of human nature for the flashing through of one ray of his divine glory! Such is the necessary inconsistency of the system.

3. Agnosticism ignores the vital distinction between the unknowable and the inexplicable.

The theist insists quite as strenuously as the agnostic on the limitations of human knowledge concerning God. But limitation is something quite different from negation. The agnostic brands all so-called knowledge of God as illusory, unreliable, unreal. The theist maintains that human knowledge of God is real and trustworthy as far as it goes. The peasant knows nothing of actinic and ultra-violet rays, of wave-lengths and angles of refraction; but he does know that a sunbeam is, for example, luminous. Now, the luminosity of light is just as

reliable and real a fact about light as any other. No theist ever dreamed that design and causation express the totality of the divine existence, but that they are true potencies of it, quite as really as any unknowable attributes can be, and that they are clearly and inevitably knowable every theist believes.

The agnostic's refusal to read the divine symbols, on the hypothesis of their total inconceivability, would logically compel him to distrust the alleged existence of his fellow-men; for no human being ever yet had a complete knowledge of the personality of his fellows. Yet such incomplete knowledge of their characters and thoughts was never deemed a basis for doubt as to the reality of their existence. No more should the fact that we cannot by searching find out the Almighty to perfection warrant us in affirming that such knowledge of him as we do possess is chimerical. Far less than complete and exhaustive knowledge of an object is necessary to convey to us its reality.

4. Agnosticism does violence to reason in bidding it deny design in nature.

If there be any thing with which we are acquainted, it is the qualities and habits of mind. More thoroughly schooled are we, than in any thing else, in its characteristic ways, its foresight, its ingenuities and address in the face of difficulties, its insight of laws and forces. When, therefore, we find in nature, say in the human hand, the same shrewd methods, calculations, co-ordinations, multifarious adaptation, structural triumphs, what else can we rationally call it but the presence of thought? If we can ever identify any thing, we can identify that bright-eyed force we have delighted in and consciously exercised from the beginning.

The agnostic admits that the world of matter *looks* as if design were present in it, but of set purpose he will not acknowledge it as design. Well, then, what does he call it? This keen and deft planning, as every man out of a million would acknowledge it to be—from what does it result, if not from either intelligence or accident? Well, he blandly replies, from something or other in the unknown, which is neither intelligent nor non-intelligent. Thus our agnostic Uriah Heep, so cautious and 'umble, that he would not dare say that the sign-manuals of mind all about us are not forgeries, grows

all at once bold and dogmatic. In the face of effects he has seen produced ten thousand times by mind, and never by any thing but mind, he is too timid to say it is a case of mind, but quite brave enough to declare he thinks it is something else than mind, he knows not what. In other words, he heroically creates out of his wanton fancy a third cause, not one of whose traits is known to him, to replace a cause than which nothing can be more familiar.

Our agnostic is an evolutionist. Suppose we apply his method to that hypothesis. He cites multiplied instances of effect of environment, natural selection, and survival of the fittest. We blandly tell him, "It *looks* as though there had been an evolution, but plainly there has not." "What is it then?" he demands. We reply, "O, something or other else, we don't know exactly what; for we, too, are agnostics."

O thou strange Something-or-other, not intelligent, and not non-intelligent, thou cunning mechanism of the agnostic's fancy! Thou art not a Thinker, and yet thou dost think; thou art no Planner, and yet the world is full of thy glorious planning. Thou hast made me like thyself, though it was neither intentional nor accidental, but something or other else. I love to think thy thoughts after thee, though they are not thoughts. But thou couldest not think my thoughts after me, for my thoughts are fraught with design, and an uncounted number of my ways are altogether intentional, and neither accidental nor something or other else! Thou mightest follow the progress of much of my thought, but my most poignant griefs thou couldest not fathom, for those griefs spring from certain sins, and those sins were the result of certain clear and dogged designs!

5. Agnosticism does violence to reason in denying a First Cause.

The human mind can never be better acquainted with any thing than it is with the invariable and necessary relations of cause and effect. In the cradle it began to know itself as a cause, by watching movements of members which it found to be voluntary, and lifting up a voice of its own. As time went on, experience found ten thousand results assignable to nothing but individual personal volition. In millions of instances the fabric of life was found to be woven together with the warp and

woof of cause and effect. The belief in causation is universal, and of the very substance of mind. The tares in the field inevitably suggest the presumptive enemy. The untutored savage, arguing a vanished bear from the broken twig, and the erudite Leverrier, postulating an undiscovered planet from certain celestial perturbations, agree in declaring that every effect must have a cause.

Our agnostic concedes cause and effect, if you will ask him to go no farther than the realm of the senses. As far as the world of matter is concerned, you cannot make your assertion of rigid causation any too strong for him. But venture never so short a distance into the supersensible realm, and he casts it to the four winds.

He prizes causation as a golden key to unlock mystery here —what key does he treasure to unlock mystery out there with his unknowable God? Causation? Nay, nay, that be far from him! Road-bed and steel rails run into the fog. Shall we assume road-bed and metals beyond? No, indeed! Ditch the train at the edge of the fog.

We should never have suspected, if we had not been told, that conscientiousness is at the bottom of the agnostic's caution. Indeed, Clifford went so far as to affirm that a "belief in a power outside ourselves is an immoral doctrine." In the face of this stupendous effect we call nature, it would be sinful presumption, downright immorality, to postulate a stupendous Cause; that is to say, a God. Nay, rather, something or other else! It is the conscientiousness of the colored witness on the murder trial. On cross-examination he testified: that he did see the prisoner taking aim; he saw the puff of smoke, the falling body, and trickling blood; but the bullet?—no, he did not see that! Our agnostic admits that the universe bears all the signs of a genuine case of cause and effect, but that a proper scientific conservatism compels him to say that it may be a case of something or other else, he is not sure what. The reddening of litmus in a test tube cannot get on without a supposititious acid; but an effect a million times more prodigious need not have had a cause!

6. Agnosticism robs human character of its grandest inspirations.

The relations which theism gives man to an Almighty God

have the most important bearing on his character. It has taught him that behind and before him are moving the majestic forces of Divine Providence. It has enabled him to show more than mortal daring and enterprise, because it has taught him to believe himself defended, sustained, and inspired by an Unseen Power. He has gone gayly into the desperate charges of the battle-field, because he has been led to believe that he had more than human panoply; he has been brave and calm in the thickest of the fight, because be believed he saw a sign of celestial promise in the heavens.

The background of divine personality has glorified human life. It is something more than a mere process of vegetation. The issues of existence have seemed of unspeakable moment. Men have been moved to seek a divine way of living the humblest lives. They have borne themselves as though possessed of a priceless charge. Thought? God thinks. Love? God loves. Faithfulness and truth? They are the vital breath of Him who was, and is, and shall be.

The agnostic claims human fellowship for himself. But the theist claims something more—divine fellowship. The theist has found himself transfigured by the consciousness of the divine omniscience. God knew his bosom sorrow. God knew how patiently he was bearing ineffable torture for truth's sake. He has endured as otherwise he never could have endured, because he saw the invisible.

Now, a system which takes away Godward relations from man, thereby deprives him of the most important formative influences which his spiritual nature can have. The battle of life is too fierce and vast for mortal man to go into it single-handed. If human existence is to exert its most potent inspirations, it must be felt to be everlastingly significant. Man cannot approach his own ideal of moral perfection without a more august influence than mere human recognition and sympathy.

We do not like the agnostic's new heavens and new earth. We cannot feel that they are fitted to these souls of ours. His little skies are too low for us. His mountain breezes are the blasts of a steam fan. His man, walking his puny earth, is a victim of vivisection. The intuitions that tell him of the Unseen and all-precious moral distinctions have been withdrawn by a trepanning process, and the rent sewed up again.

He walks the earth, indeed, after the fashion of the poor pigeon, robbed of a part of its cerebral substance, but plainly enough he is not the *man* he was before.

7. Agnosticism removes the foundations of morality. The contest with this genteel foe, then, is no mere abstract issue of formal logic. It is one that comes home to business and bosom. It has to do with the very foundations of human society.

Human instinct has founded the sanctions of right and wrong in the unalterable constitution of the divine nature. Sin, we instinctively feel, is not mere harmless human whim or idiosyncrasy, but an eternally destructive enmity against God. It is no mere human pleasantry, but veritable dynamite in the royal palace. And righteousness is not simply good-naturedness, but the very smile and health of God himself. But, if God be unknowable, that dreadful background of Divine holiness that has so often silhouetted human transgression is removed, and the heinousness of sin with it; that Being of perfect purity and benevolence, ever lamenting over man's iniquity, and yearning to help him out of the calamity thereof, whose smile he has been taught to expect when he does well, whose frown he was to dread when he had done ill, has no existence. It is a great day for the man who has bound us and spoiled our goods, when the omniscient eye is plucked out of heaven.

Now, it is due to the agnostics to say that they have felt the dire sociological peril of declaring the throne of the universe vacant. Accordingly, after cutting the nerve of moral character in its relations to a holy God, they have suggested various galvanic substitutes therefor.

Professor Clifford had signal success in finding the secret of consciousness in the constitution of matter. "The atoms of mind-stuff," said he, "when they fortuitously coalesce in certain ways form a consciousness, and in other ways do not!" Can any one, after pondering that luminous statement, doubt the Professor's ability to give conscience a materialistic basis also? If so, let him note the new atomic thunder from the modern Sinai: "So act that all thy deeds may have molecular, not massive, antecedents." Think of men swearing to their own hurt and changing not, because the fear of the molecules is before their eyes. Imagine the future Nelsons firing the hearts

of their men by crying, "England expects every man to do—deeds that have molecular antecedents!" Fancy the criminal of the future warning his generation from the gallows-tree against the fatal influence of massive antecedents, and bemoaning the lamentable lack of the molecular in his own character! What a sorry parody is such idle vaporing on the majestic, authoritative, and universal morality of the theistic system!

Agnostics have endeavored to find an adequate basis and inspiration for virtue in the interests of mankind at large. Said the same writer: "The dim and shadowy outlines of the supernatural deity fade slowly away from before us: and, as the mist of his presence floats aside, we perceive with greater and greater clearness the grander and nobler figure of him who made all gods, and shall unmake them. From the dim dawn of history, from the inmost depths of every soul, the face of our Father Man looks out upon us with the fire of eternal youth in his eyes and says: 'Before Jehovah was, I am.'" "The face of our Father Man" is, of course, a highly poetical figure applied to the whole race. This, then, is the new deity in whose face our souls are to find moral inspiration, from which approbation is to shine and reproof to frown. Alas! we are already only too well acquainted with our Father Man. We know only too completely the deceitfulness and desperate wickedness of his heart. He is a kind of Father Noah; he has done some pretty good preaching, indeed, but it is too notorious that he has followed it up with very strange ways of living. Nay, we cannot worship our Father Man; we have too many times had to go backward and cover him with a mantle. Worthy enough as philosopher and friend, he may be; but he is no moral guide. It is the too careful walking in some of his footsteps that has hitherto brought us sore travail and remorse of conscience.

But will the welfare of our Father Man keep the needle of conscience true? Frederick Harrison professes to think so. Death to him is personal annihilation. Let us eat and drink, then. Not so, says Mr. Harrison. Think of your posthumous activities The humblest soul that ever turned a sod sends a wave through the ever-growing harmony of human society. There is no God; there is no future life for us or for the race; but there are generations of men coming after us, and moment

by moment we ought to conduct our lives with reference to their interests. Not the cry of Saul, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" but, What would the Hottentots and Tartars and Australians of the twenty-fifth century have me to do? The bare statement of such a theory exhibits its vapidity. It has, as a moral motive force, about as much strength as the tiny galvanic current which a silver coin produces under a man's tongue. The most of us have about all we can do, Mr. Harrison, denying ourselves and laying down our lives for the men of the nineteenth century, with the wail of their sufferings entering in our ears. We are only too conscious of having failed to clothe a naked contemporary in the next ward and visit a personal acquaintance in prison in the next street. That biblical "Thou God seest me" does move us to desire truth in the inward parts, but your coming man of the forty-ninth generation, we very much fear, will be left to take care of himself.

The agnostics have claimed, by sheer vehemence of assertion, that their system inculcates a nobler morality than Christianity, and for confirmation of the assertion have cited certain of their own number. Never was claim more specious and impudent. It is the parasitic mistletoe sucking its life juices from the generous veins of the lordly oak, and then boasting a greener leafage and heavenward tendencies. Christianity breathed into the agnostic the very beginnings of moral life. She poured out the treasury of her heavenly secrets for him when he first began to think. He can no more isolate himself from her influence than he can isolate his lungs from the life-giving oxygen of the atmosphere. The world never saw an agnostic pure and simple. The morality of a person who never existed need not detain us.

Attractive as is the new name, it does not hide the old heartache. To take away the Lord is quite as grim and pathetic an enterprise now as when Isaiah wrote his forty-fourth chapter. To be without God is still to be without hope. The dictum "I do not know" is as little in harmony with the inmost experiences of the soul as with the spirit of the time. Men want to know; and the yielding up, voluntarily or involuntarily, of the fact that they do know leads to despair. A most touching example of such despair is the famous epitaph ascribed to the gallant and outspoken Peter of the agnostic apostolical circle.

Now, a system that is practical atheism, that lacks self-consistency, that ignores such vital distinctions as those between the inexplicable and the unknowable, that denies design and a first cause, that robs human character of its noblest inspirations, that removes the very foundations of morality, must soon demand an epitaph. What words are more fitting than those of its own inspiration: "I was not. I lived. I am not?"?

ART. V. — THE METHODIST DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

HISTORICALLY and doctrinally the atonement is fundamental. Historically, the atonement is the outward, objective fact in the work of Christ—the events of whose life, from the incarnation to the crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, and session, make up the continuous fabric of his mediatorial existence, and constitute the historical foundation of his religion—which makes Christ Jesus a Helper, and his salvation a help, different, in essence and power, from all others that have been offered to humanity. Doctrinally, the atonement is that central truth in Christian theology which gives distinctive character to Christianity as a system of ethical and religious thought. Historically, it is that event in the external order of the actual life of the world which has organized Christianity as the most powerful engine in modern civilization, and as the exclusive religion, for the regeneration of mankind. Doctrinally, it is that dogma in the scientific and intellectual elaboration of the theological teachings of the New Testament by virtue of which Christianity, as revealed and absolute truth, the unique religion, must be intolerant of all external systems, and, in the sphere of apologetics, refuse to co-ordinate with itself any ethnic religion or any set of philosophical doctrines.

Not only does the doctrine of the one atonement in Christ build the wall against all enemies that attack from without: it is the living organizer of all the inward elements of the truth. The doctrine of atonement stands in a relation that is adequately described only as vital and organic to the leading elements of a completed Christian theology. According to the beginning

point, it molds, or is molded by, the other doctrines. As is our doctrine of atonement, so will be our conception of the character of God, of the dignity and worth of humanity, of the heinousness and demerit of sin, of the person and work of the Son of God, of the office of the Holy Ghost, and of the value of the glad tidings which the Church is commissioned to herald to the nations. A degraded theory of atonement drags all the other principles of the Christian system to its own low level. A false or incomplete soteriology works radical and wide-spread mischief. It begets a shallow theology—a fragmentary and partial outlook upon the divine nature; a vicious anthropology—a hasty and superficial diagnosis of the ethical constitution and history of the human race; an unworthy hamartiology—a representation of sin as a light matter, a mere disturbance of external order, to be met by a governmental expedient; an unbiblical Christology, in which Christ may be only the mightiest of many mighty teachers, reformers, and saviours; an impertinent pneumatology, in which there remains little or no place for the gracious leadings and cleansing of the Spirit; and an enervating ecclesiology, in which the Church is stripped of her glory and sinks into the category of the other social and moral agencies which are at work among men. In reverse order, one may begin with inadequate doctrines concerning God, Man, and Sin, and he will as surely reach an inadequate doctrine of Salvation, for Salvation is designed to harmonize God and Man by the destruction of Sin. Salvation is the mediatorial doctrine, as Christ, the Prince of Salvation, is the mediatorial person. In either case, to purify and enlarge the one doctrine of atonement, until the polemic theologian shall bring it to occupy and altogether fill the great place assigned it in the New Testament, is to correct and amplify any system into which it enters, and conform all the components of that system to the biblical standard.

Especially is the right appreciation of atonement necessary to the normal growth of Protestantism. It is the correlate of justification by faith. Rome may have the sacrament of penance, the repeated sacrifices upon the altar, and the Church's deposit of the supererogatory works of the saints of all ages, by which to cover sin. Protestantism—blessed truth!—has only the blood of Christ, and in his name only pronounces blessing upon the head of that man whose sin is covered.

Both the defenders and the enemies of the faith instinctively recognize that in the atonement is to be discovered the one sufficient reason for the being of Christianity. The peculiar end of the Church, separated from communion with the ends of any other society whatsoever, at once the warrant of its organic existence, and the guarantee of its continued life, until the accomplishment of the commission received from the Church's Head, is the proclamation of the finished redemption in Christ. The Church is a mission, celestial in origin and equipment, in the midst of a population foreign and estranged. To this Church is given the ministry of reconciliation, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself; to her ministers is committed the word of reconciliation that, as embassadors for Christ, they may beseech sinners to be reconciled to God. Announcing that God is reconciled to *man*, on the basis of this reconciliation the Church prays *men* to be reconciled to God. Hence arises the desire on the part of rationalists and Broad-Churchmen to explain away the atonement, and on the part of those whose faith has received the supernatural religion, with all of its historical and doctrinal contents, to establish the foundations here once for all.

To this instinctive sense of the situation are to be traced, also, the continued production of treatises and multiplication of theories, which are frequently not professional and theological, but partake of a semi-literary character. Horace Bushnell and a whole school of English and American writers have written for a public wider than the theological, or even the distinctively religious, and have found readers beyond the walls of theological seminaries and the ranks of the clergy. Men hesitate to recognize that element in the eternal and immutable constitution of the divine nature which demands purity and holiness, and pronounces desert of punishment upon sin. Therefore they ask, Is there any thing in God to fear? and we have had a revival of superficial theories, not only of the Socinian, Grotian, and governmental types, but also of a moral and purely sentimental character. As a contribution to the settlement of the true doctrine, as held with almost undeviating uniformity by Methodism, upon scriptural, historical, and dogmatic foundations, this paper is written.

The safest, as well as the most strictly scientific, method of

discussing the atonement would doubtless be, first, after the manner of exegetical and biblical theology, to collocate and carefully interpret all the express texts and all the extended teachings of Revelation upon the doctrine under examination, so as to bring the truth into our minds just as it lies in the Scripture. A classification of truths and summary of results would naturally follow. Reason and the logical understanding would now bring to light the necessary and universal principles and implications of the biblical statements, and, if possible, a single formula would be reached, embracing all the essential attributes of the doctrine, which, for the dogmatic theologian, would be the definition of atonement. Lastly, an historical survey would enable us to apply the test of the truth, as embodied in the definition reached by the processes described, to all the forms of the doctrine as set forth by the teachers and theologians of the universal Church. But the limits of this paper forbid the employment of this complete and scientific Exegetical, Dogmatic, Historical method, and it may the more freely be departed from since the exegetical ground has been frequently gone over with great thoroughness and accuracy, and with comparative freedom from dogmatic bias, while the historical treatment is rather in the interest of caution and additional interest than essential to the establishment of the doctrine. A proper point of departure, therefore, may be from the position of the systematic theologian, while exegetics largely, and perhaps historical theology to some extent, will be made to serve important uses in the progress of the discussion.

Let us make a beginning by placing side by side two Methodist definitions of the atonement. By Methodist definitions, definitions by recognized Methodist theologians are meant. The latest, and, so far as the writer knows, the only, distinct treatise on atonement that Methodism has produced is the work of Dr. John Miley, Professor of Systematic Theology in Drew Theological Seminary. Dr. Miley early in his monograph gives us a formal definition of atonement. It is as follows:

> The vicarious sufferings of Christ are an atonement for sin as a conditional substitute for penalty, fulfilling, on the forgiveness of sin, the obligation of justice and the office of penalty in moral government.*

* Miley, "The Atonement in Christ," p. 23.

The second definition is taken from the unpublished lectures on the Twenty-five Articles of Religion of the Methodist Episcopal Churches delivered by the late Dr. Thomas O. Summers, as Professor of Systematic Theology in Vanderbilt University. The definition is in this language:

> Atonement is the satisfaction made to God for the sins of all mankind, original and actual, by the mediation of Christ, and especially by his passion and death, so that pardon might be granted to all, while the divine perfections are harmonized, the authority of the Sovereign is upheld, and the strongest motives are brought to bear upon sinners to lead them to repentance, to faith in Christ, the necessary conditions of pardon, and to a life of obedience by the gracious aid of the Holy Spirit.*

An analytical comparison of the two definitions reveals several points of difference. 1. Dr. Summers calls atonement a satisfaction made to God, which form of expression Dr. Miley not only excludes from his definition, but carefully avoids and stringently opposes throughout his treatise, since he identifies the satisfaction theory with the Calvinistic scheme of commercial substitution, always calling this last mentioned doctrine the doctrine of satisfaction. 2. Dr. Summers gives the atonement relation to original as well as to actual sin, as is done by our Second Article of Religion—"whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile his Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for the original guilt, but also for actual sins of men."† This Dr. Miley's definition ignores, and his whole essay does not touch the question except when he glances at the relation of the atonement to infant salvation;‡ and in this momentary consideration it would appear that he attaches little weight to the teachings of the fifth chapter of Romans, since he makes no reference to it. A brief statement of exegetical results, if nothing more, would have been very pertinent. 3. Dr. Summers makes the atonement consist of the entire mediation of Christ, *especially* of his passion and death, while Dr. Miley speaks only of the vicarious sufferings, though he is doubtless

* This definition is taken from the writer's notes as a member of Dr. Summers's class. The writer alone is responsible for the form given, but he has every reasonable guarantee that it is an exact reproduction of the Doctor's language.

† Southern Methodist Discipline, ed. 1882, p. 12.

‡ Miley, "Atonement in Christ," pp. 262–265.

in complete accord with Dr. Summers, as is evinced by his masterly treatment of the great passage in the second chapter of Philippians: "The incarnation itself is a great fact of atoning value in the redemptive mediation of Christ. . . . There are two marvelous facts: the self-emptying—ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε—or self-divestment of a rightful glory in equality with God; and an assumption, instead, of the form of a servant in the likeness of men." * Nevertheless, we are not to overlook the superiority of Dr. Summers's definition in point of comprehensiveness. 4. Dr. Summers assigns three results to the atonement, or grounds it in three necessities, though it is but right to state that the last he did not class in respect to urgency with the other two great necessities. In this last particular he and Dr. Miley are again in agreement.† The three results or necessities are, (1) The harmonization of the divine perfections. This follows from the previous doctrine that the atonement is a satisfaction made to God. (2) The upholding of the authority of the Sovereign. (3) The bringing to bear of the strongest motives upon sinners to repent and believe. Here Dr. Summers has most felicitously combined all the elements of truth in the three great theories of atonement, Satisfaction, Governmental, and Moral. Dr. Miley represents the atonement only as a conditional substitute for penalty, fulfilling the obligation of justice and the office of penalty in moral government. His atonement yields only a governmental result, and has its only ground in a governmental necessity. He himself has chosen the title and uniformly calls his theory Rectoral, or Governmental. 5. Finally, Dr. Summers's definition includes the securing of a life of obedience by the gracious aid of the Holy Spirit. He thus effectually guards the doctrine of atonement and its correlate justification by faith from antinomian accusation and abuse. He answers those objections that have been in the mouth of opponents from the time of Paul, the original expounder of these truths, until the present. Here doubtless our two Doctors are also in harmony; but mark the grasp and reach of Dr. Summers's formula. There may be other minor points of difference between these two definitions. It is not necessary for our purpose to be exhaustive; the differences enumerated lie out broadly on the face of the two formulas.

* Miley, "Atonement in Christ," pp. 276–278. † *Ibid.*, pp. 125–126.

But let us be careful that Dr. Miley's doctrine is not mistaken or misrepresented. It may be that he has not been able to include explanation, enlargement, and exposition within the limits of definition. Is it entirely certain that he does not ground the necessity for atonement in the essential nature and immutable character of God apart from his rectoral office and relation? It is granted that there are some passages in his book that on first reading, and considered apart from the underlying and pervading principle of his doctrine, seem to admit such a necessity. But a more attentive examination will often reveal limitations and saving clauses in the passages themselves; and, further, they are rebutted by explicit assertions to the contrary. An extended consideration of Dr. Miley's teaching, as will be shown by large quotation, will make it appear that he does not allow a separate and distinct demand for atonement in the divine nature apart from God's office as a Sovereign. He earnestly contends that if such a demand be allowed it must yield an atonement by commercial substitution, or, as he calls it, satisfaction. So far as a demand for atonement in the nature of God may be regarded as acknowledged by Dr. Miley, he identifies it with, and absorbs it in, the demand that lies in the necessities of government. His section in which he vindicates the necessity for atonement is entitled "Necessity in Moral Government."* "The necessity for the redemptive mediation of Christ lies ultimately in the perfections of God," he says, and we think here is the great truth unequivocally stated, but he immediately adds the saving phrase, "as moral Ruler."† In the same connection he continues:

> We have the truth of a divine moral government as the ground-fact in the necessity for an atonement. We have found the facts and principles of such a government strongly affirmative of this necessity. They thus respond to the explicit affirmations of Scripture thereon. Further, we have found this necessity to be grounded in the profoundest interests of moral government, for the protection of which the penalties of the divine justice have a necessary function. Here we have the real hinderance to a mere administrative forgiveness, and, therefore, the real necessity for an atonement. The true office of atonement follows accordingly.‡

* Miley, "Atonement in Christ," p. 74. † *Ibid.*, p. 73. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

The penalties of divine justice are, therefore, not the manifestation of God's essential rectitude and holiness abstracted from all governmental considerations, nor is there any bar in the divine nature to sovereign forgiveness—this bar is wholly the demand of governmental exigencies. It is not desired to attach any inference to Dr. Miley's doctrine that he does not himself avow, and he shall be freely, but briefly, quoted by passages taken from every part of his book:

In the governmental theory, the scientifically consistent necessity arises in the interest of moral government, and as an imperative requirement of some provision which may fulfill the rectoral office of penalty in the case of forgiveness.* . . . We ground the necessity in the fact and requirements of moral government.† . . . And God, as a righteous Ruler, must inflict merited penalty upon sin, not, indeed, in the gratification of any mere personal resentment, nor in the satisfaction of an absolute retributive justice, but in the interest of moral government, or find some rectorally compensatory measure for the remission of penalty.‡ . . . While divine penalty falls only upon sin, the supreme reason for its infliction is in the rectoral ends with which moral government is concerned. Nor is the penal infliction a moral necessity apart from these ends. § . . . There is no sufficient reason why sin must be punished solely on the ground of its demerit. . . . And, all other ends apart, [the ends of moral government apart from the demands of God's essential nature,] retributive justice may remit its penalty. *It may do this without an atonement.* ‖ . . . And with no absolute necessity for the punishment of sin, it seems clear that but for the requirements of rectoral justice, compassion would triumph over the disposition of a purely retributive justice.¶ . . . But as penalties are remissible so far as a purely retributive justice is concerned; so, having a special end in the interest of moral government, they may give place to any substitutional measure equally securing that end.** The demerit of sin imposes no obligation of punishment upon the Divine Ruler.†† The rectoral ends of moral government are a profounder imperative with justice itself than the retribution of sin, simply as such.§§ The cross is the highest revelation of all the truths which embody the best moral forces of the divine government.‖‖

We challenge that both in the New Testament and in Christian experience the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ is infinitely more than the embodiment of the forces of moral government!

* Miley, "Atonement in Christ," p. 61. † *Ibid.*, p. 63.
‡ *Ibid.*, p. 75. § *Ibid.*, p. 226.
‖ *Ibid.*, p. 228; italicizing added by the writer. ¶ *Ibid.*, p. 232.
** *Ibid.*, p. 229. †† *Ibid.*, p. 233. §§ *Ibid.*, p. 233. ‖‖ *Ibid.*, p. 239.

> And real as the divine displeasure is against sin and against sinners, atonement is made, not in its personal satisfaction, but in fulfillment of the rectoral office of justice.*

It would be well if Dr. Miley could definitely tell us what is his conception of displeasure against sin and sinners in such a being as the unchanging and holy God. Is it appeased without a consideration? Is it a mere temporary affection, an ebullition of personal feeling, that, after the analogy of human wrath, will burn itself out and gradually die away if let alone?

> Yet the atoning sacrifice of Christ neither appeases the personal displeasure of God nor conciliates his personal friendship.† *Could a sinner, without the helpful grace of redemption, sincerely repent and render a true obedience, there would be a coincidence upon him of the divine regards of personal friendship and judicial condemnation.* ‡

Such a conclusion, the legitimate outcome of Dr. Miley's theory, which he has had the frankness to explicitly state, stamps that theory as untrue. The idea here expressed is utterly unbiblical. Dr. Miley cannot produce a single proof-text from the New Testament containing an approximation to the thought contained in this strange sentence of his. We know that God loved us before the atonement, and that his love provided the atonement—this truth will receive full treatment before the discussion closes; but God's love producing an atonement for the satisfaction of his holiness that he may forgive the sinner is widely different from a coincidence of the divine regards of personal friendship and judicial condemnation upon a person for whom no atonement has been made. A man may be the possessor of the personal friendship of God and yet under sentence of judicial condemnation! Almighty God is your friend—your personal friend—and yet you are in danger—in danger of eternal death! This omnipotent personal friend, in whose favor you abide, is powerless to help you! God has constructed a government that ties his own hands and nullifies his own personal friendship! He cannot bless and save a sinner whose attitude and state he personally accepts! God's law is holier than God's nature! The immaculate God, who is a consuming fire to all sin, can endure and

* Miley, "Atonement in Christ," p. 247. † *Ibid.*, p. 249.
‡ *Ibid.*, pp. 249, 250; italicizing added by the writer.

accept that which his law condemns and punishes! One more quotation will be sufficient:

> But for his regard for these rights and interests, [of moral government,] and, therefore, for the sacredness and authority of his law as the necessary means of their protection, *he might have satisfied the yearnings of his compassion toward us in a mere administrative forgiveness.**

It is very clear that Dr. Miley means to leave us no reason for mistaking his doctrine. If he has passages that speak of God's personal displeasure against sin, he is careful to explicitly inform us that the atonement is not grounded in any necessity for the propitiation of this displeasure. So pointedly does he put this, and so completely does he absorb the personal wrath of God, and the primitive desert of sin, in the ends of moral government, that he tells us that, apart from moral government, mercy and compassion may so dominate justice and holiness in the essential nature of God, without any sort of consideration or satisfaction offered to the offended Deity, that he might forgive sin, so far as it is an offense to his own purity and personal righteousness, by mere Sovereign prerogative, while the only obstacles are interposed by moral government, considered in itself, and these insuperably prevent administrative pardon. Hence the necessity for atonement is grounded in moral government alone.

The question now arises, Is Dr. Miley's the Methodist doctrine of atonement? Can we regard it as fortunate that the only express Methodist treatise on atonement should ground its theory exclusively in a governmental necessity? Does Dr. Miley's theory adequately interpret Scripture in those profound texts which represent the demand for propitiation and reconciliation as arising among the divine attributes in the innermost recesses of the divine nature? Or is Dr. Summers nearer the truth of Scripture, and nearer the Methodist doctrine as taught by Watson, the first, and Pope, the last, of great Methodist writers on Systematic Theology? Can the atonement be represented as a satisfaction to God, a harmonization of the divine nature and attributes, and a reconciliation of God to the world, without the errors of the Calvinistic theory of commercial substitution? Can we hold fast the

* Miley, "Atonement in Christ," p. 272; italicizing added by the writer.

profoundest teachings of the New Testament without abating one jot or tittle of all the meaning that an undogmatic and scholarly exegete will find in them, and yet reject the Calvinistic soteriology? Watson, Pope, and Summers seem to think those Scriptures teach that atonement is a real satisfaction to the demands of the divine nature, and that this is consistent with the true Arminian doctrine of atonement, Dr. Miley to the contrary notwithstanding.

Dr. Miley, to some extent, recognizes the fact that he is not in accord with the trend of Methodist doctrine. Richard Watson is allowed to have made statements which assign him to a theory of atonement that Dr. Miley finds it necessary to criticise and reject.* He acknowledges that many leading Arminians are to be classed with Watson. Dr. Pope's doctrine so little harmonizes with Dr. Miley's that he is but once alluded to, and that upon an insignificant side issue.† The writer does not undertake to say exactly what theories of atonement are held by Drs. Whedon and Raymond, since he has never met with the article and sermon of the former referred to by Dr. Miley, and, while his cursory examination of the "Systematic Theology" of the latter reveals passages which seem to commit him to the doctrine that atonement is a satisfaction to God,‡ he is not sufficiently informed to be competent to classify his system. But in quoting Drs. Whedon and Raymond, Dr. Miley thinks it expedient to argue that the principles held by them issue in the governmental theory, while he candidly admits that Dr. Whedon has never called his theory governmental, and is careful to say that he would not identify Dr. Raymond with a theory which he discards.§ As shown by the two definitions, Dr. Miley's theory is widely different from that of Dr. Summers. Here, then, we have a recognition of Watson as holding another theory of atonement, a tacit acknowledgment of want of harmony with Pope, a consciousness that in formal statement and title of theory the support of Whedon and Raymond cannot be claimed, and of a great gulf between Summers and Miley. Dr. Miley, though not making an issue with the Methodist doctrine as such, certainly would not claim to represent it.

* Miley, "Atonement in Christ," p. 117. † *Ibid.*, p. 205.
‡ Raymond, "Systematic Theology," vol. ii, pp. 249, 310.
§ Miley, "Atonement in Christ," pp. 212–214.

By pointing out these facts, it is not intended to create any prejudice against Dr. Miley, or even an *a priori* presumption against the truth of his theory in advance of the argument upon its merits. It may be freely admitted that advance in scientific theological statement, as in every other department of human thought and activity, must come through the work of the specialist. The monographic treatment of the minute student of a single section of Christian doctrine ought to differ widely, in method, and possibly in results, from the work of the general writer on Systematic Theology. We expect his work to abound in criticisms, and, if the whole truth and the exact truth has not before been reached, he is the man to define, elucidate, establish, and defend it. Certainly Dr. Miley is privileged to work up the doctrine of the Atonement, as Dr. Pope has presented the doctrine of the Person of Christ, Dr. Whedon the doctrine of the Will, and Dr. Summers the doctrine of Baptism. Certainly he may show, if possible, that Watson and Pope and Summers are wrong, and that if Whedon and Raymond had been making a specialty of atonement their acknowledged principles would have developed into a scientific treatment practically one with the doctrine Dr. Miley has set forth. All this may be fairly granted. But the question is, Has he succeeded in accomplishing such a work as this?

Dr. Miley has continually written upon the assumption that there is no middle place between the Rectoral theory and the Calvinistic theory of commercial substitution, which secures the unconditional discharge of all for whose sins Christ's death paid the penalty, and carries with it all the Calvinistic peculiarities of limited atonement, unconditional election, irresistible grace, and final perseverance. This he has misnamed the Satisfaction theory. Watson, Pope, and Summers are certainly satisfactionists; but this is not their theory. Miley denies that there is any scientific place for them. They must either be Calvinists, or give in their adhesion to the pure Rectoral theory. But it is strange that all these Methodist theologians, some of whom were certainly possessed of as much exegetical skill, metaphysical acumen, and logical power as Dr. Miley has manifested in any part of his treatise, should have all lodged in an unscientific and indefensible half-way position, unable to see

that if they abandoned the Calvinistic theory of commercial substitution their principles must carry them over to the governmental theory of atonement. Dr. Miley is free to essay the rescue of Methodism and of these uncritical theologians from an inconsistent doctrine; but, undoubtedly, the whole ground must be very carefully reviewed before he can be permitted to hold the field unchallenged. He must make good his position.

It is an acknowledged principle laid down by Dr. Miley, in common with others, that any theory of atonement, to be valid, must adequately interpret the Scriptures. Systematic theology, like systematic science, is the formulating of general propositions and laws which must fully embrace and explain all the individual phenomena grouped under them. The fatal defect of the rectoral theory, however it may approve itself to a shallow rationalism, is, that it is not an interpretation of Scripture in its profound representations of propitiation and reconciliation. The issue with Dr. Miley is made at once just here. The writer of this paper is not desirous of setting forth his own naked and unsupported opinions and interpretations; when he can add to the native worth of the argument, he advances the authority of those whose theological learning is unquestioned, and who have earned the right to be heard. Dr. Pope is one of the most accomplished of the many learned Greek exegetes of Great Britain, which perhaps leads Germany in the single department of New Testament criticism and interpretation. The pre-eminent merit of his great work on Systematic Theology is its approximation to biblical theology in its close adherence to exegetical methods. Here we have few of those long chains of abstract reasoning that fill so many other bodies of divinity, in which there are no quotations from Scripture, and little attempt to rest the pillars of the argument upon supporting biblical deliverances. Dr. Pope has set forth the true doctrine so lucidly and succinctly that the argument conducted by frequent quotation from him must be largely the gainer thereby. His general preparatory statement is made in this language:

> The teaching of Scripture on this subject may be summed as follows: The Finished Work, as accomplished by the Mediator himself, in his relation to mankind, is his divine-human obedience regarded as an expiatory sacrifice—the Atonement proper. Then it may be studied in its results as to God, as to God and man, and

as to man. First, it is the supreme manifestation of the glory and consistency of the divine attributes; and, as to this, is termed the Righteousness of God. Secondly, as it respects God and man, it is the Reconciliation, a word which involves two truths, or rather one truth under two aspects: the propitiation of the divine displeasure against the world is declared; and, therefore, the sin of the world is no longer a bar to acceptance. Thirdly, in its influence on man, it may be viewed as Redemption, universal as to the race, limited in its process and consummation to those who believe.*

Here Dr. Pope has not thought it necessary even to allude to governmental necessities and results. He employs a biblical vocabulary and such modes of speaking as are not unknown to the Scriptures. In continuation of this thought, he says, in yet more unmistakable language:

As availing for man, by the appointment of God, it is no less than the satisfaction, provided by divine love, of the claims of divine justice upon transgression; which may be viewed, on the one hand, as an expiation of the punishment due to the guilt of human sin; and, on the other, as a propitiation of the divine displeasure, which is thus shown to be consistent with infinite goodwill to the sinners of mankind. But the expiation of guilt and the propitiation of wrath are one and the same effect of the atonement. Both suppose the existence of sin and the wrath of God against it.†

Once more:

As the atonement avails for the human race, and is therefore ours, it must be viewed as a vicarious satisfaction of the claims of divine justice or expiation of the guilt of sin, and propitiation of the divine favor.‡

Dr. Pope now proceeds to the exegetical defense of these dogmatic definitions. There are two families of terms that must be at once brought forward in every discussion of this subject: the nouns *ἱλασμός* and *καταλλαγή* most fitly represent these two groups of terms and ideas. The first group is presented in three leading forms:

Christ is the Ἱλασμός, the virtue of the propitiation, and the Propitiator: *He is the propitiation for our sins;* not the Ἱλαστήρ, because the process of his propitiating is lost in the effect. He is the living Expiation. He is also the *ἱλαστήριον*, the Kapporeth, or Mercy-seat, according to the use of the word in the Septuagint, *Whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation*, that is, as a mercy-seat, between himself and sinners. Or, if the word be an adjective,

* Pope, "Compendium of Christian Theology," vol. ii, p. 263.
† *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 264. ‡ *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 269.

then *θῦμα* is understood, and he is a propitiatory sacrifice. As the high-priest he is said *ἱλασκέσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας*, that is, to expiate sins; though the English translation hides this meaning: *to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.**

Now consider the second group of terms:

The verb *καταλλάσσειν* signifies the virtue of the mediation of Christ as composing a difference between God and man, and *καταλλαγή* the result; the new relation in which the world stands to God, he being no longer an *ἀντίδικος*, and the world being no more an object of wrath. The context in the two passages where the verb is used shows that God is the antagonist.†

Coming now to discuss the specific idea of satisfaction as involved in expiation and propitiation, Dr. Pope says:

As commonly used to signify the unlimited reparation made for the dishonor done to the majesty of holiness by sin, it has no direct, though abundant indirect, sanction in the New Testament. But it evermore blends with the idea of propitiation; God is propitious, or favorably brought near, to the entire race of mankind; there is now but one *ἀνθρωπόκτονος* for whom eternal right *shall take no satisfaction*. . . . But the idea as referred to the Divine Being is really twofold: it is the satisfaction of his unutterable love which provides the atonement; and it is the satisfaction of his eternal holiness which must be a consuming fire to evil.‡

This is by no means identical with the doctrine advocated by Dr. Miley, that a sinner may be at once possessed of the personal friendship of God and exposed to judicial penalty. It is true that the atonement is to be traced to God's love as its original. But that love does not exclude co-existent divine displeasure against sin and sinners. And in order that that love might have free course to the sinner and be glorified in his salvation, it gave birth to the atonement, not as an outgrowth of governmental necessities, but as a demand arising among the divine attributes, and to remove difficulties interposed by the divine nature. This is very different from Dr. Miley's doctrine, that if the governmental difficulties were out of the way the personal displeasure could be removed without atonement. In substantial accord with Dr. Pope, the writer, several years ago, in a tract issued by the Southern Methodist Publishing House, had occasion to formulate the truths involved in this language:

* Pope, "Compendium of Christian Theology," vol. ii, p. 272.
† *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 272. ‡ *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 274.

The atonement is sometimes misapprehended. Horace Bushnell had the true doctrine exactly reversed when he maintained, in his "Forgiveness and Law," that God made the sacrifice of his Son in order to excite love and forgiveness in his own bosom toward the creature upon whom he had conferred so costly a gift, just as we find that large self-sacrifice on behalf of our enemies and their interests substitutes hate and vengeance by love and forgiveness in our feelings and intentions. Such a system, or any other, beginning with the malignity of God toward his creatures, in whole or in part, dishonors God, and is viciously false. God is love, essentially and inalienably love. God's love was not born of the atonement, but the atonement of God's love. Man lost his place in the *approving* love of God, but not in his *benevolent* love. Antecedently to the atonement of Christ God loved the world: for "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son." He did not give his Son that he might love the world. By this we understand that, while the righteous and rectoral principles of his character and government demanded the punishment of sin, and would have inflicted that punishment, he yearningly desired the salvation of his creatures. Else the incarnation and crucifixion had never taken place. He loved us while we were yet enemies, just as we love our children when we are about to inflict corporal punishment upon them. Upon the death of the Son, however, the race steps up on a new and higher plane before God. God stands in an altered relation to his creature. He not only has a desire to save, but he now has the ability to pardon, and at the same time not infringe upon the righteous demands of his character and law. Is this now, when we turn to man, unconditional? Has the sinner a claim upon God? or, has the sacrifice of Christ purchased him a *right* of forgiveness? Is the commercial conception of the atonement, as held either by Augustinianism or Universalism, according to which the price has been paid, and the bond must be fulfilled by the delivery of the purchased possession, true? Here the Calvinist and Universalist hold the same fundamental principle, for it matters not that the purchase in the one case is a part of the race, and in the other the whole. The questions asked above must be answered negatively; and we avoid Calvinism on one hand, and Universalism on the other, building firmly on the broad foundations of Arminian orthodoxy, when we consider that the demand for atonement lay in God, or in the character of God—not in the value or number of the souls under the condemnation of violated law. The atonement accomplishes simply the removal of the divine disabilities, and God now obtains only the power to consistently pardon. It is not a question of the purchase of a given number of souls by the payment of a stipulated price, but a question of making the pardon of *any* soul possible. Just the same atonement is required to make the justification of one sinner possible that would be required for an infinite number.*

* "Wandering Stars," pp. 4–6.

So Dr. Pope:

Propitiation, from *Prope*, near, indicates in the Bible that the favor and good pleasure of God is attracted to the sinner by the mediation of Jesus. HE IS THE PROPITIATION because in him God is nearer to man the sinner than even to man the unfallen. The fact that holy wrath is turned away through the atoning satisfaction is a secret behind the Incarnation: in the very essence of the Triune God. *Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son the Propitiation for our sins.* The profound truth remains, that the divine wrath and the divine love are revealed at once in Christ, but love must have the preeminence in our phraseology.*

This is sufficient refutation of the following argument of Dr. Miley's:

Why did the Father sacrifice the Son of his love in our redemption? It could not have been from any need of personal propitiation toward us. The redeeming sacrifice itself, the fruit of his love to us, is proof to the contrary.†

Unquestionably all careful exegetes will agree that the noun καταλλαγή expresses

the divine virtue of that mediatorial work which reconciles in God himself love and holiness, justice and mercy: in God himself before the Reconciliation was exhibited in the world. Of the distinction between this Atonement eternally in God and Reconciliation in the world of time we must speak again. . . . We mean by THE ATONEMENT the whole economy of our Lord's saving intervention as consummated on the cross. It is the ἱλασμός and ἱλασκέσθαι which answers to the כִּפֶּר and the כִּפֻּר. Just as we employ the term Redemption to designate Christ's work as saving man generally, and the term Reconciliation to signify the ministry through which that salvation is proclaimed; so we use the term Atonement to include the virtue of the redeeming work as propitiating the divine mercy to our race. In fact, it is the theological formula for all that belongs to that work.‡

No systematic theologian has ever excelled Dr. Pope in exegetical skill. It would be difficult to find in the whole realm of theological writing a profounder appreciation of the exact teaching of Scripture than is expressed in the following passage, especially in the concluding sentences:

---

* Pope, "Compendium," etc., vol. ii, p. 275.

† Miley, "Atonement," etc., p. 272.

‡ Pope, "Compendium," etc., vol. ii, p. 275.

The divine HOLINESS is exhibited as conspicuously as the divine love, so far as concerns the process of redemption: love is supreme in the origination, and will be supreme at the end—for *mercy rejoiceth against judgment*, not over it, though over against it; but in the actual atoning work the justice of holiness, demanding the punishment and extermination of sin, is displayed in the most awful manner of which the human mind can form any conception. It is important to remember that Holy Scripture never makes such a distinction between the love and the holiness of God as theology thinks it necessary to establish. The mercy that provides and the justice that requires the atonement are one in the recesses of the divine nature. Their union or identity is lost to us in the thick darkness of the light which we cannot approach. The cross of Christ, or rather the whole mediation of the Redeemer, equally and at once reveals both. *Herein is love*—to quote once more the final revelation of Scripture on this subject—*not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son the Propitiation for our sins.* In our infirmity we find it needful to correct our estimate of one attribute by appealing to the other. The Scripture scarcely condescends to that infirmity. It speaks of the divine ἀγάπη as ordering the whole economy of what is, nevertheless, an ἱλασμός or propitiation, and of the divine εὐδοκία as ordering the whole economy of what is nevertheless a καταλλαγή. We shall hereafter see how these four words meet in the sacrifice of the cross, where love reigns through the infinite sacrifice of love.*

Could any thing be more beautifully or more truthfully said? The superficial theology of Dr. Miley's theory is driven away like chaff before the strong wind by such complete presentation of the whole content of the sacred writings. Dr. Pope is as careful as Dr. Miley to leave us in no doubt concerning his conception of the necessities and results of atonement:

> The change of relation is mutual: God lays aside his displeasure against mankind, being propitiated in the intervention of his Son; and all men, through the ministry of the Reconciliation, are invited to enter into a state of acceptance with God, laying aside their enmity. †

Dr. Pope does not for a moment entertain that superficial and sentimental error that the reconciliation is only of man to God, not of God to man. If our view must be one-sided and incomplete, our doctrine would be nearer the truth if it held only the great biblical fact of the reconciliation of God to men:

---

* "Compendium," etc., vol. i, pp. 278, 279. † *Ibid.*, vol. ii. p. 282.

Not to betake ourselves to abstract principles, the Scripture must be our appeal. The few sentences containing that aspect of the Saviour's work which views it as the Reconciliation speak in their context of a divine wrath, and in such a way as to give wrath its uttermost meaning. In the classical Corinthian passage we read *not imputing their trespasses unto them*, which has behind it, or rather before it, that most solemn declaration, *Who though he knew not sin*, was MADE SIN for us. These last words give the key to the whole doctrine; closing the statement of it with deep emphasis. . . . When he who *knew no sin* was *made sin for us*, the wrath of God against our transgression was expended upon our Representative, and diverted from us. He reconciled the world to himself by removing from it, as a world, his eternal displeasure. What is now going on through the ministry is the winning of individual souls to the enjoyment of the divine peace. For the full interpretation of this classical passage it is necessary to consider more distinctly the meaning of both terms: Reconciliation and World. The entire world of mankind God is said to have reconciled to himself in Christ, inasmuch as the atoning sacrifice was the actual realization of a purpose which had been regarded as wrought out from the beginning of human history. An economy or relation of peace had always prevailed in his government of a sinful race. . . . The purpose of redemption was an eternal purpose. . . . There was in heaven an Atonement before the Atonement. . . . The term [Reconciliation] may be said to characterize the kind of administration the Supreme Ruler has exercised over a guilty race. . . . As the world has received a Saviour or Deliverer, and the Gospel is preached to the world, so the world has from the beginning had the benefit of the amnesty. But a dispensation of forbearance BEFORE Christ is IN Christ a dispensation of perfect Peace. Hence the Gospel is called the *ministry of reconciliation*. God is administering, through the stewards of this ministry, a system or economy of forgiveness and peace. The embassadors of Christ announce a general declaration of the divine good-will to the world. Their ministry is not so much to induce sinners to lay aside their opposition to God as to persuade them that God has laid aside his opposition to them, not imputing their trespasses. . . . There is nothing said here of a reconciliation between the upper intelligences and man, or between both united and God; it is evident that the atonement is a ground of amnesty in the divine government universal so far only as the human race is concerned. The cross belongs to the world, and to all the world. Its two arms stretch backward and forward, to the beginning and to the end of time. So it is in a parallel place: *For he is our Peace . . . that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby;* what enmity he slew is explained by the reconciliation UNTO GOD. The result is that the life of salvation reigns. . . . The race in its unity is, notwithstanding sin, placed in a relation of

peace with the Supreme Ruler, so that the holy heavens can still canopy an unholy earth. . . . Our being reconciled never means our putting away our enmity, but the revelation in us of God's mercy. This is evident in the apostle's words to the Romans: *For if, when we were enemies*, under the displeasure of God, ἐχθροὶ ὄντες, we were reconciled to God, *κατηλλάγημεν τῷ Θεῷ, by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled*, having become partakers of divine grace, *we shall be saved by his life. He is our Peace*, St. Paul says, just as he is our Saviour, our Lord, our Head. And those who *have received the Atonement*, or who are *justified by his blood;* that is, who do not reject the reconciliation which is announced to them in the Gospel—have *peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.* The preachers of the Gospel declare the message of their embassy, and beseech men in Christ's stead: *Be ye reconciled to God.* But they mean only: Submit yourselves to the mercy of Heaven. St. Paul gives another expression to the same truth: he adds, *And came and preached peace;* after that description of the atonement already quoted, which speaks of his having *slain the enmity* on the cross.*

What a Gospel! Glorious truth! How unspeakably great and precious the message of reconciliation committed to the embassador for Christ! What a response in peace, in joy unspeakable and full of glory, this Gospel receives in Christian experience! How unanimous the testimony of ecumenical Methodism!

"The angel said unto them, Behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, . . . and suddenly there was with the angel a multitude" praising and saying—*Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις Θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας*: *Glory to God in the highest*, this is one member of the angelic antiphony,—*and peace upon earth among men of good-will*—toward whom God is well-disposed,—here is the responsive member.

Let Historical Theology, in concluding, render us some slight service. Referring to Socinianism, Dr. Pope says:

> It refuses to admit of any immutable qualities whether of justice or mercy in the divine nature, these being only expressions of his occasional will, called out, as it were, by the conduct of man. An eternal justice demanding punishment is inconsistent with an eternal mercy prompting to forgive. Satisfaction for sin is incompatible with love. Against this objection it is enough to say that it opposes the first principles of scriptural teaching concerning God, who is represented as reconciling in himself these opposite attributes by an atonement which is at

* Pope, "Compendium," etc., vol. ii, pp. 283–287. Paragraphs and sentences from all these pages have been grouped for quotation.

once and equally an expression of both, and regulating his will. Thus our doctrine is safe from Socinian censure only when it first shuts itself up in God, and grasps the reconciliation of justice and mercy in the divine nature.* There are two everlasting safeguards of the truth: the constitution of the human mind, which bears witness to the wrath as well as the love of God, and the express revelation of Scripture concerning the reconciliation.†

Once more. In Dr. Pope's final historical summary the beautiful harmony and almost marvelous coincidence of Pope and Summers may be clearly seen:

> Most of the errors that have passed in review have sprung from failure to connect the three leading biblical ideas: the atonement in God, as a necessity in the divine attributes; the reconciliation on earth, as vindicating to the universe the rectoral justice of God; and the exhibition of the redemption to man, as moving upon his conscience and will and heart. Here unite what are sometimes called the SUBSTITUTIONARY, the GOVERNMENTAL, and the MORAL INFLUENCE theories. The union of these is the scriptural doctrine, as it is set forth in Scripture; and especially in the Epistles of St. Peter, St. Paul, and St. John: the last giving in many particulars the finishing touches in the union of the Person and the Work of Christ. Neither of these theories is valid, standing alone. Each is necessary as the complement of the others. The doctrine would commend itself more than it does to the minds of all devout persons if justice was done to every aspect. The champion of either of these theories who thinks it necessary absolutely to deny the truth of the others proves that his own is wrong.‡

The later theologian builds on the same foundation with the older. Watson in his "Theological Institutes," Part II, chapter xx, develops *in extenso* a doctrine in all essential points in accord with that of Dr. Pope. The difference is that between the polemical and argumentative systematic theologian who for several generations was the type of an English divine, and the exegetical, polished, brief, scholarly, uncombative treatment of the theologian who is a master in all the rich developments of the most recent biblical and theological learning both in England and in Germany. Many passages might be quoted from the familiar pages of this twentieth chapter of Watson; but in the special interpretation of the critical passages on which the doctrine turns this would be but to dupli-

* Pope, "Compendium," etc, vol. ii, p. 310. † *Ibid.*, p. 312. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 314.

cate, in some cases very strikingly, the spirit and results of the quotations already made from Dr. Pope. The extended treatment which Dr. Summers gave in his lectures developing his definition was divided into three sections on the Satisfaction, Governmental, and Moral aspects of the atonement. On the doctrine of the atonement, Watson, Pope, and Summers are a unit.

The limits of this paper do not permit us to enter upon the minute discussion of the relation of the atonement to original sin. Suffice it to say that Dr. Miley has accorded no special treatment to this great question in any section of his work; and, moreover, in his cursory allusions to the manner of infant salvation, he shows no critical appreciation of the doctrinal teachings involved in any really adequate exegesis of the fifth chapter of Romans, verses twelve to twenty-one. A special treatise on the work of Christ for the salvation of men that gives no account of this passage can hardly proceed upon so thorough-going a principle as to revolutionize the theology of Methodism. Paul says: "So then as through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness the free gift came unto all men to justification of life. For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous." But in Dr. Miley's system there hardly seems to be a place for this Pauline fact.

The scope of this paper will not be mistaken: it is meant to ascertain and present the doctrine of atonement as held by Methodism. Watson, Pope, Summers—all Englishmen, though the last a representative of American Methodism—Miley, Whedon, Raymond—these six authors, all ministers and theologians of Wesleyan and Episcopal Methodism, are the only writers to whom reference has been made. Fletcher might also have been embraced in our *consensus*, but he may serve us a good turn at another time.

ART. VI.—THE SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF "THE DEVIL."

"THE world is very evil," wrote Bernard of Clugny, at the beginning of his famous hymn to the New Jerusalem: but probably the thought was there introduced only as a commonplace—a fact of which all were presumed to be aware, and the recognition of which might heighten the apparent fitness of what he was about to say of that "better country." But the existence of evil in the world is a fact of universal experience. "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together," and, as the wisdom of hoary antiquity declares, "man is born unto trouble as the sparks fly upward." Men instinctively pursue courses of life and action, and develop characters and conditions of heart and mind, which surely lead them into trouble. How our world became so bad, and how such an imperfect condition of things can continue in the domain of Infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, is the "mystery of mysteries," which confounds all finite thought; and yet with this question, man's folly and presumption have perpetually busied themselves in futile attempts to solve the inexplicable riddle, "And of their vain disputings find no end."

There is a natural evil which has its seat in the physical system, and is affected by the conditions and environment of sensitive subjects, but of that we have not now to speak, except incidentally. Another form of evil of a purely spiritual nature is recognized and illustrated in the Bible, which it calls SIN, of which the religious and ethical teachers of all others than the Jewish nation appear in no case to have had any adequate conception. Whether or not men are subject to natural evil, except as the result of moral causes or conditions, is a question not altogether undeserving of attention, and it is also beset with very considerable difficulties, however it may be answered. Naturally and philosophically, it would seem that pain and suffering are inseparable from animal existence among the conditions of this present world—if, indeed, irrational creatures are capable of conscious suffering—and yet to concede it would open up some very far-reaching inquiries. The existence of moral evil, SIN, in the world, and the development of its results, under the

divine government, as it is a matter of infinitely deeper interest, appears also as a still more profound and tremendous mystery. When we are asked how this can be, we reply in our ignorance that "an *enemy* hath done this." It is all the work of the DEVIL. And when our children ask us why God allows the Devil to continue doing all this mischief, we are compelled to confess that the whole subject is too deep and high for our thoughts. Proud philosophers have vainly attempted to explain these mysteries with their babbling "Theodicies," prating

> "Of Providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate,
> Fixed fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute;"

but the devout and God-fearing lay their fingers upon their lips and silently confess that they cannot answer, though their faith in God assures them that although SIN exists for the time being, and works its fearful ruin in our world, it is still within the grasp of the divine power, and that the decree has gone forth, "*Thus far* and no *farther*."

Perhaps some incidental advantages may have resulted from such futile attempts to solve these deep mysteries, and that, too, among the most favorable conditions. It seems, indeed, to have been the divinely ordered mission of the Greek philosophy, and before that those of Persia and India, to test to its utmost the mind's capability of finding out God and understanding his counsels. "The world by wisdom knew not God," and this was demonstrated and at last confessed; and the enforcement of this intellectual despair was among the processes by which the age of the advent became "the fullness of the time." The human mind demands something to be believed, and philosophy had conspicuously failed to respond to that demand; and men were, therefore, the more willing to listen to the voice of God speaking from heaven, and still more to attend to the words of Him who came in person to reveal to men the deep mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. But these revelations are, however, only in part, and there still remains not a few "secret things" which God has reserved to himself, to inquire into which is neither wise nor reverent. Holy Scripture recognizes the existence of SIN in the world, tells how it became a *fact* in man's history and character, and, best of all, how its curse may be avoided. Beyond this it is silent; and we are

left deeply interested spectators of the sublime drama of the overthrow of the great *Adversary* and the destruction of his kingdom.

The Scriptures in treating of SIN simply recognize it as a *fact*, without attempting to propound any theory respecting its origin, except that it is derived from an extra-mundane source, and brought into the world by a spiritual being, neither divine nor human, called variously the *Devil*, (διάβολος,) the *Adversary*, and *Satan*. He is also called, on account of his occupations, the "Tempter," the "Accuser," and the "Destroyer." This person is a perpetually felt presence in the doctrinal teachings of Holy Scripture, and a *factor* in all of life's problems. As God himself is the one great object of theology, pure and simple, so in the theo-anthropology of the Bible is the ever-present and always effective "party of the other part," standing over against God—*the Adversary*.

The biblical account of the beginning of *sin*, as a fact in human life and history, presents the Devil as its promoter and procuring cause. Whatever theory may be adopted respecting the drapery of the story of the Fall, the diabolic presence and efficiency remains. Nor does it appear that without that influence the sad event which brought sin and death into our world could have occurred. So, too, the progress of the conflict which the incoming of SIN precipitated is every-where marked by the same presence and power; and the successful accomplishment of the work of the Messiah, as declared in prophecy —which by reason of "the work of the Devil" is a militant campaign—is to be signalized by the complete discomfiture and overthrow of the *Adversary*. Any system of theology, so-called, that fails to recognize and make prominent the personality and the active antagonism of the Devil, is not *quo ad hoc* —so far forth—the theology of the Bible, nor can it be brought into harmony with the chief features of that great body of revealed truth. The scriptural idea of the Devil is that he is the personal embodiment of a great spiritual force, constantly acting in the divine realm—the mental *cosmos*—and which is, as to men's spiritual natures, a steady and terribly perilous impulse toward "the evil." On this pregnant truth St. Peter bases his godly admonition to believers, to which all would do well to take heed: "Be sober, be watchful: your adversary the

Devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour: whom resist steadfast in the faith."

To examine in order, however briefly, all of the many passages of Scripture in which the doctrine of the presence and spiritual influence of the Devil in human affairs is taught, would entirely transcend our limits; we therefore select a single one, the elucidation of which will largely illustrate nearly all that is given on the subject. That passage (John viii, 44) reads: "*Ye are of your father the Devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it.*" These are Christ's own words spoken to the Jews, who were violently opposing him in the temple only a few days before his passion.

The conflict in which our Lord was then engaged, which appeared outwardly to be simply between himself and the Jewish rulers, had broader relations, and was of more than any merely incidental significance. It was a conflict of truth against falsehood—of God in Christ against the Devil—and its crisis was even then at hand. Our Lord, too, appears to have been intent on placing the parties to that conflict each in his proper position, himself doing the work committed to him by the Father, and those to whom he spake arrayed against him doing the work of their father—the Devil. And, that all might clearly understand the case in all its bearings, he in remarkably clear and comprehensive terms not only designates the Devil as the active antagonist of the work of Christ, acting through those directly addressed, but he also describes his character and his ever-enduring relations of antagonism against God—alike in character and action.

Looking carefully into these words of Christ, we find in them not only a clear recognition of the Devil as a person, but also a strongly marked expression of his character, with, perhaps, (and perhaps not,) some reference to his history. They also, and especially, indicate his relations to wicked men, and to *sin* as it is found in men. Respecting this last particular, which may be noticed first, it is shown that the wickedness of men, as displayed in their conduct, is, as to its source and procuring cause, of the Devil, and that he holds to evil men the relations

of a father, by some kind of ethical genesis. By some process which from its nature is hidden from human scrutiny, the spiritual and moral characteristics of the Devil have passed over to, and become abiding qualities in, men's spiritual natures; and as the characteristics of the father are reproduced in his children, by the laws of heredity, so the ethical character of the Devil re-appears in wicked men, and therefore he is properly called their "father." And it should be further observed that this form of expression indicates more than simple likeness in kind or similarity of character; it embodies the notion of *causation*—of generation. Men are what they are, in their native depravity, because the Devil has made them so; and their badness, though really their own, is, at the same time, *of the Devil.* Their evil propensities—ἐπιθυμίαι—are therefore called "the *lusts* of your father," as coming from him, though developed in themselves. These lusts are, however, none the less their own because of their derivation, as is well remarked by Meyer, (H. A. W.,) "The conscious will of the child of the Devil is to accomplish that after which its *father*, whose organ it is, *lusts*." All this, indeed, differs but very little from the catholic doctrine of "Original Sin" as it has been taught and held in the Church: that it consists not primarily in the action, but in the depraved condition of the soul, derived by inheritance from a corrupted stock, which itself became such at first through diabolical agency.

The presentation by our Lord of such an awful and profound mystery as that of the relations subsisting between sinful men and the Devil made it proper that some fuller statements should at the same time be made by him respecting that unique and formidable personage. Following the words of our Lord a little farther, we find a clear and explicit recognition of the Devil as a rational and intelligent person, with a fully determined ethical character. These words of Christ, uttered among such circumstances, can be understood only in their most obvious signification. It must not be said that he was speaking according to the prevailing notions of his times, for he was directly antagonizing those notions. He was also speaking as the divine *Logos*—the true Light—and was enunciating original revelations of the things which he had seen with the Father. Whatever, therefore, as is either expressly

declared or naturally implied in these words, must be accepted as the truth; and the things thus clearly and authoritatively ascertained may also be used in order to determine the sense of related passages in other parts of the Scriptures.

First of all we have here to notice how clearly and distinctly the personality of the Devil is recognized. The whole form and conditions of the discourse forbid the supposition that there can be any thing like a figurative personification, as though he was playing with some rabbinical legend or personifying the "abstract principle of evil"—itself an empty figment. There is also running through this whole discourse a coupling together, though with widest contrast, of God and the Devil—each the father of his *own*—so implying personality in the latter as really and fully as in the former; and to both alike personal attributes are constantly ascribed. We can form no conceptions of the attributes of truth and falsehood except as predicates of persons. Even logical and mathematical truth can become any thing more than barren abstractions only by becoming lodged in individualized minds, that is, by appearing as personal attributes. When, therefore, the Devil is characterized as essentially false—"a liar and the father of falsehood," as "abiding not in the truth," and "speaking falsehood from his own nature"—there is all along direct implications of his proper personality, which is quite too clear and manifest to permit them to be set aside as simply figurative expressions for which there are no real objects.

The Devil is also here brought into notice as a *moral force* capable of acting upon other *moral beings*. His spiritual proclivities—"lusts"—evil desires, because of his own essentially evil nature—are reproduced in his children, that is, depraved men, in whom they become laws of action. It is by virtue of this transmissible moral force which inheres in the Devil, and is able to reproduce its kind in other spiritual natures, that he acts as the "Tempter," and becomes the father of sinful men. By the reproduction of his own impulses to evil in other minds—through the mysterious impact of one spiritual nature upon another, a fact of universal experience, and as such steadily recognized in Scripture—the Devil acts as an evil influence among men, and all who receive him and yield to his enticements are changed into his own moral likeness, that is,

become his children. It seems, therefore, that our Lord's words, when he speaks of the Devil as a *murderer*, and *apostate*, and *liar*, could not have been used without very great impropriety in any other sense than as predicates of a real and consciously active individuality, that is, a person.

Having thus set before his adversaries the Devil as their father—in respect to their ethical characters—our Lord next proceeds still further to characterize the great *Adversary*, and in so doing to characterize those whom he addressed. He is, first of all, "a murderer"—*ἀνθρωποκτόνος—a man-killer*, which epithet should probably be understood as descriptive of his character rather than a reference to some fact, though the historical element may not be entirely wanting. The moral character of the Devil is here chiefly under notice, and yet there may also be an allusion to the fact of the seduction of our first parents, by which they and all their posterity became subject to the death spoken of in Rom. v, 12, and the reference will apply equally well whether the death there indicated shall be understood as natural or spiritual, or both. The notion advanced by Schleiermacher that Jesus had no intention to teach any doctrine regarding the Devil, but merely to add force to his reproach by referring to the generally adopted interpretation of the narrative of the Fall, cannot be accepted. We must, on the contrary, conclude with Meyer that he lays down the doctrine, (of the person and character of the Devil,) and also intentionally and explicitly expounds it.

"If the epithet a murderer here applied to the Devil is to be understood as simply a designation of his character, then the qualifying words, *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, from the beginning*, must be understood to refer to the beginning of his own existence; or the phrase may be understood adverbially, *always*, from the beginning onward, without intending to fix any initial point. That probably is the primary sense of the passage, which, however, does not exclude the secondary, and not less important, one, that his evil nature was displayed *in the beginning* of the history of our race, in the work of temptation, which "brought death into the world."

That the overt act of killing, either consummated or attempted, is not necessary to constitute one a *murderer* is shown explicitly by St. John, (1 John iii, 15,) who assumes

that "hating one's brother" is a sufficient indication of that character. The whole spirit of our Lord's teaching favors the same idea—making the ethical spirit, of which the completed action is only the formal result, the criterion of character. The same thing is elsewhere illustrated in nature. Certain kinds of animals are accounted carnivorous, and though through the force of circumstances some one of such a kind should be reared without having tasted flesh, that fact would not remove that animal from the category of *carnivoræ*. The lion that has been reared in a cage, and, of course, never engaged in the hunt, is, nevertheless, simply by virtue of his nature, *a beast of prey*. So all in whom the spirit of hate abides and dominates, though they may never have performed an act of violence, are "man-killers;" and such was the Devil when, with murderous purposes, he engaged in the work of temptation in Eden and in the wilderness of Judea. If, however, the application of that epithet to the *Adversary* shall be understood to refer to the temptation and the Fall of our first parents, then the phrase "from the beginning" may seem to point to that transaction. The idea, which has found supporters, that there is here a reference to the case of Cain and Abel, has much less, in all its conditions, to commend it to favorable consideration, though in the passage in the First Epistle of John that case is referred to as an instance in point of the outcome of this deadly hatred of the heart.

It is, however, a rather far-fetched and forced construction of the language of our Lord respecting the Devil, to deduce from it any thing respecting the history of that mysterious person, either as regards his origin, or how he became "that wicked." He bursts upon the field of spiritual vision like an unheralded comet in the heavens, covering half the sky, and filling the nations with alarms—simply ὁ διάβολος, *the Devil, your Adversary*—and all that we know of him in all the past, is what is here told us, to wit, "he abode not in the truth." This clause, however, which if it stood alone might seem to be capable of a historical construction, is deprived of that power by that which immediately follows it, to wit, "because the truth is not in him." "Truth" is not to be contemplated as something apart from its subject, in which he might be considered as abiding, as in an atmosphere, while in himself—his

own moral and spiritual being—there is no truth. His not abiding in the truth is therefore not at all indicative of any *change* in his spiritual *status*, but rather an indication of his historically unchanged and essential *badness*. This text, therefore, affords no support to Delitzsch's inference that, at some point in the past eternities, "the Devil, instead of *taking* his stand in the truth, revolted, as the god of this world, and selfishly, against God, for which reason the world has been 'degraded and materialized' by God." This notion of Delitzsch, it will be seen, implies that certain great cosmical changes have been effected either directly *by*, or else mediately *through*, the development of sin, in the person of the Devil; and that our present world is a reconstruction from the ruins of an older and a better one, into which new world have entered not a few evil conditions and elements. It is enough, at this point, to say of all this that is it *purely gratuitous*, not to say *fanciful*. Meyer's rendering of this passage seems, therefore, to be decidedly preferable: "The passage under consideration," he remarks, "treats merely of the evil constitution of the Devil, *as it is*, without giving any hint of its origin. . . . In respect to the fall of the Devil nothing is here taught. If any such event is taught in the Bible, it must be found in some other places."

Let us, then, inquire of the Scriptures to ascertain, as nearly as we may, what they do, indeed, teach respecting what has been called, perhaps not improperly, the Natural History of the Devil. Turning to "M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopædia," article *Satan*, (which name is treated as synonymous with Διάβολος, *the Devil*,)—in which article is embodied very happily, though briefly, the whole subject, wrought out in a truly liberal spirit, though not altogether uninfluenced by the traditional and popular notions with which it is every-where beset—we find, first of all, the concession that "of the original state or nature of Satan little is revealed in Scripture;" and to this is added the further significant statement, the correctness of which will not be questioned, that "most of the common notions on the subject are drawn from mere tradition, popularized in English by Milton, *but without even a vestige of scriptural authority*." It is quite evident, however, that the writer of that article, although he seemed to discard the authority of the Miltonian angelology, nevertheless took that

system with him, as a theory to guide him in the interpretation of the Scripture passages made use of—and, with a preconceived theory in one's mind, almost any thing may be proved out of the Bible. The Devil's spirituality, as contradistinguished from any conceivable form of matter, is so clearly and constantly implied in all that is said of him in Scripture, that there is the less need of any direct proof on that point; nor need we for that purpose overstrain the language of St. Paul, (Eph. ii, 2,) where he speaks of "the *spirit* that now worketh in the children of disobedience"—for the term "spirit" is not unfrequently applied in a much wider and freer sense, and even to living men. The descriptive terms there used, however, are highly significant of his relations and influence among men. The entire absence of any possible evidence in Scripture of the Devil's possessing any other than spiritual attributes may be accepted as conclusive evidence that he is truly and properly a spiritual being, without any material *corporeity*. This conception of the personal substance of the Devil must effectually remove from him, in such conceptions, every thing like physical power or agency in nature. When, therefore, we see him designated "the prince and power of the air," we, of course, understand the word "air" in a purely tropical sense. "The power," says Dr. Browne, in Lange's Commentary, "which the prince (that is, the Devil) controls is described as "of the air," for in this (that is, the spirit of the ungodly world—*society*) are found the place and character of the power, its medium, region, and domain, its means and modes." The whole description of his power implies only a spiritual nature and influence, presenting him as a rational and spiritual being of superhuman power, wisdom, and energy. Any thought, therefore, of his acting upon the world as a physical force, whether in the air, or on the sea, or in men's bodies, is puerile and absurd.

It is also necessary to guard against any attempt to identify him with the race of *demons*, either as being of the same nature, or as having any affiliation with them. It should be clearly understood that the *Devil* is not a *demon*, and that the *demons* are not *devils*. The prince of demons spoken of in the New Testament (Matt. xii, 24, 26) is not *Satan*, but *Beelzebub*—quite another and a very different person. Respecting the

latter, we are told by competent authority that "the name was that of a heathen deity, to whom the Jews ascribed the sovereignty of evil spirits. . . . All notices of Beelzebub are exclusively connected with the subject of *demoniacs*." * The name *Devil*, properly applied, has no plural, simply because there is but one Devil, unique, solitary, and without recognized kindred, except human souls perverted to his own nature and image.

Respecting his beginning, the Bible is absolutely silent, and all conjectures or traditions about that matter are worthless, superstitious, and misleading. How he became the "evil one" that he is, and in which character he is exclusively spoken of, is also not revealed to us, and the subject itself is incomprehensible. On the one hand, we cannot conceive that the infinitely pure and Holy One either *would* or *could* create a spiritual being with a moral character the direct opposite of his own; and, on the other hand, we cannot understand how a being all of whose spiritual impulses are in harmony with the divine, having been "created in righteousness and true holiness," could, out of the impulses of his own nature, fall into sin, and become transformed into "that wicked." Here we are brought face to face with the tremendous and absolutely insoluble problem of the *origin* and *perpetuation* of evil—the existence of *sin* in the domain of infinite righteousness.

According to the traditional angelology, the germs of which were brought into the Church from the later Jewish legends—themselves of Oriental origin—and augmented and brought to a system during the Middle Ages, (from the fifth to the fifteenth centuries,) and finally reduced to the form of a history in Milton's great epic—which has both supplemented and superseded the authority of the Bible on that and many other related matters—the Devil is a fallen archangel, himself having been the leader of a great apostasy and rebellion in heaven—whence he was driven by the Son of God, against whom he had especially rebelled. The mythological and legendary origin of many parts of Milton's great poem are well known to all classical scholars, and to adepts in the legendary literature of the Dark Ages and of the Renaissance. This theory appears to have been accepted as a whole by the writer of the Cyclopædia article to which we have referred, and yet he concedes that the

* Smith's "Biblical Dictionary."

passage on which "all this fabric of tradition and poetry has been raised" is Rev. xii, 7, 9, which tells of "Michael and his angels" fighting against "the dragon and his angels," and how "the great dragon, called the Devil and Satan," was "cast out into the earth, and his angels cast out with him," though it is also granted that "this account cannot refer to the original fall of Satan;" and certainly it bears the character of a *prophecy* rather than a *history*. But if the corner-stone of the structure is thus removed, on what shall it now rest? We turn, next, to 2 Pet. ii, 4, and read, "For God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to *Tartarus*, and delivered them into chains [Rev. Ver., "committed them to *pits*"] of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment," which, with the nearly parallel passage in Jude, may be accepted as the nearest approach to a direct proof of the matter in question. The question respecting the canonicity of these two epistles may be passed over with the remark that it is not well to base a very questionable doctrine on an equally questionable, so-called scriptural, statement. These epistles may (and they may not) be integral portions of the inspired record; and their claim to acceptance as such must largely consist in their agreement with the other Scriptures; they are scarcely competent so to teach any thing when standing alone. But if admitted as competent witnesses, what do they prove? The term "angels" is used in Scripture with a good deal of latitude; and, without departing from the biblical *usus loquendi*, it may here refer to either *men*, or *demons*, or *celestial spirits;* the first may be so called in their disembodied state, just as, while in the flesh, they are called the *children* of the Devil. Those who account demons to be of the hosts of Satan (as we do not) may well claim the references of these passages to that order of beings; or if, indeed, they are creatures of a higher order, neither their character, nor the occasion, nor the date, nor the method of their expulsion from heaven is revealed.

The word *Tartarus*, it is well known, is borrowed from the Greek mythology, where it was the name of the prison-house of those who fell under the malediction of the gods. The older writers, as Homer and Hesiod, make it the prison of only the gods, while *Erebus* is the prison for lost souls. As used by St. Peter—if, indeed, the genuineness of the epistle is con-

ceded—it must mean either *Hades* or *Gehenna*, but his words have much more of a mythological than a biblical tone and coloring. It seems, therefore, scarcely allowable to rest so important a doctrine as that of the fall of Satan and a large share of the holy angels, changing them into devils and shutting them up in Tartarus (literally "Tartarizing" them) to await a future judgment, upon so slender a basis of proof. It is too much like balancing the pyramid on its apex. In Matthew xxv, 41, a passage whose authenticity and inspiration will not be questioned, our Lord speaks of "the Devil and his angels," for whom the "eternal fire" was prepared; but as wicked men—lost souls—were to be driven thither, we must believe that it was prepared for them, and therefore that *they*, rather than some other order of beings, of whom nothing is clearly revealed, were the angels of the Devil there named. Angels are uniformly taken to be purely spiritual beings; such is the Devil, and such are disembodied souls. They, therefore, may be denominated "angels;" and as they are the children of the Devil they are his.

Outside of the Apocalypse—which is usually understood to refer to later times, and therefore need not be considered here—still two other passages, one in the Old Testament and one in the New, have been taken as proofs of Satan's expulsion from heaven. On the return of the Seventy, when they had rendered their account of the success of their mission, (Luke x, 18,) our Lord said, "I saw Satan, as lightning, fall from heaven," which to a mind already prepossessed with the traditional idea of his expulsion from heaven can very readily be made a proof-text in its support. But the occasion on which it was spoken, and the evident purport of the whole passage, leave but little room to doubt that it is there used in reference to the discomfiture of the Adversary by the preaching of the Gospel; and, so understood, it is a prophecy and not a reminiscence. Meyer renders this passage, "I then perceived" (in sending them out to preach) "the speedy overthrow of Satan from his lofty power, as it were a flash of lightning out of heaven." A passage in Isaiah (chap. xiv, 12) speaks of "Lucifer, son of the morning," as "fallen from heaven;" but its application to the king of Babylon is so obvious that only the fertile imagination of some one of the later Church fathers

could have found in it a reference to the Devil's expulsion from heaven; and yet this was done by Jerome, and others have followed in his steps, though the interpretation is certainly unauthorized and fanciful. No competent critic will now concur in its support.

Having carefully examined all the passages of Scripture that are usually cited in proof of the original angelical state and character of Satan, we are compelled to say that they wholly fail of the purpose, and therefore that it is not a scriptural doctrine. What he was in the ages of the older eternities we are not informed, nor what he will be in the eternities of the future. God knows. But what he now is, in his relations to Christ's kingdom and to our own spiritual estate, we know; and here are our great interests in the matter. The New Testament, interpreted agreeably to its obvious sense, that is, without reading into it what is not there, nor failing to see and accept what certainly is there, very clearly exhibits, standing over against the power and agency of Christ and the Holy Spirit in their great work in this world, another and adverse power and agent, himself a formidable spiritual force, called the *Devil* and *Satan*, the *Accuser* and the *Destroyer*. He is all the time spoken of or referred to as a rational being with a clearly recognized ethical character, and other personal attributes are freely predicated of him. The existence of the Devil as a rational, spiritual person, *powerful*, *adroit*, and altogether *wicked*, is very clearly a doctrine of the New Testament. Our Lord, in all the provisions and processes for setting up his mediatorial kingdom in our world, steadily recognized this adverse power and its agent, and the attitude of Christ's kingdom—the Church—was made thoroughly militant, and its success was to be a triumph, because of the presence and adverse power of the Devil. The warfare on the opposing side is none the less *diabolical* as to its source and inspiration, because it is usually made effective through human agencies, that is, the emissaries of the "god of this world, the spirit that now works in the children of disobedience." The form of Christ's triumph in his Messianic work, in all its intermediate stages, and until the final and glorious consummation, is seen in the deliverance of redeemed souls from the power of the Devil; and the last great victory will consist in the utter overthrow of

Satan, represented figuratively by his being led in chains, after the manner of Roman triumphs, and the complete subversion of his kingdom. That conflict is now proceeding; those intermediary triumphs are secured as souls are being redeemed from sin and Satan by the power of the cross, and as peoples and tribes become subject to the power of the Gospel; and the final triumph—though as counted by earth's calendars that event may be very far off—is steadily, and indeed rapidly, drawing near.

The scriptural method of referring men's evil devices and doings to the Devil—which surely cannot without great and irrational perversion be referred either to prevailing superstition or to the use of figures of speech—necessarily implies both his power and his personal being. In the Book of Job we see "the children of God" coming together, and Satan also coming among them as an *Accuser*. The prophet Zechariah shows us "Joshua the high-priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand" *as his Adversary*. David, in the pride of his heart, numbers Israel; Judas betrays his Master; and Ananias and Sapphira "lie to the Holy Ghost;" but in each case Satan appears as the prompting cause. The disciples, under the instructions of the Master, were slowly coming to know the truth; but Satan was not indifferent, but desired to have them that "he might sift them as wheat," and when Peter blurted out the worldly impulses of his heart respecting his Master's work he was rebuked as if himself a "*Satan*." The most practical and plainly expressed precepts and exhortations of the New Testament, teaching us our duties and warning us against our dangers, are all along emphasized and treated as critical on account of the assumed presence, the subtlety, the malignity, and the power to do harm, unless carefully resisted, of "your *Adversary* the Devil." These things are, indeed, presented as together constituting a principal factor in the great problem of our spiritual life and the effectuating of our personal salvation. The end aimed at in our Christian diligence is that we may deliver ourselves out of the *snare* of the Devil; and in putting on the panoply of God is that we may be able to stand against the wiles of the Devil; and our confidence is that our Lord himself will "bruise Satan under his feet" in us. This godly jealousy for

our salvation is also intensified by the fearful possibility lest "as the serpent beguiled Eve in his craftiness, your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ." Thus at every point, whether of encouragement or warning, of danger to be shunned or victory to be won, the fearful presence of the *Adversary* must be recognized and provided against.

It only remains now that we briefly and concisely recount the conclusions to which our review of this subject brings us:

1. There exists in the spiritual *cosmos* a *being* of vast power, called the Devil, Satan, the Adversary, etc.,—an ever-active force, essentially *wicked*, and perpetually warring against God, *in* and *through* mankind, for the promotion of sin and the ruin of souls.

2. The Holy Scripture gives us no account of his origin, nor any intimation respecting his history before he appeared in this world.

3. Through the *fall of Adam* (by the temptation of the Devil) our world (that is, the whole human race) has come under his domination, so making him *the god of this world;*—"*the prince and power of the air*," "the ruler of this world."

4. This person is himself purely spiritual, and capable of acting upon men's spiritual natures, to deceive and incite them to sin; but wholly independent of all physical laws of subsistence, and unable to act in any wise physically or mechanically.

5. He is now the great inciting and stimulating cause of the actual sin found in our world, as he was the procuring cause of original sin.

6. In the conflict now proceeding in the spiritual *cosmos* Christ (as Messiah) and the Devil are the leading combatants, and every man is abetting one or the other side.

7. The end and outcome of the conflict now pending in our world—of which the human race is at once the subject, the arena, and the prize—shall be the complete triumph of Christ over the Adversary and his own glorification as the Head of the triumphant Church; in which all men who shall have been with him in that conflict, shall share in his triumph and glorification; while the Devil, and all who remain his liege subjects and abettors, shall be driven away to receive the destiny prepared for them.

Art. VII.—PROBATION AFTER DEATH.

[Second Article.]

The Scripture argument on this subject in the January number of this Review, besides making clear that the passages most strongly relied on as favoring the continuance of the day of grace beyond this life do not sustain it, answers a not infrequent inquiry for the proof that a probation after death is impossible, by showing (1) that the teachings of our Lord and his apostles limit probation to the present life, which excludes it from the next, and (2) that they base the decisions of the final judgment upon conduct in this world, and in no way on conduct afterward. Either of these positions is conclusive upon the point for all who accept the Scriptures as authoritative in matters of religion.

There are, indeed, many passages of Scripture which, at first glance, apparently point to the salvation of the race, such, for instance, as tell us that Christ tasted death for every man; that he wills that all men shall be saved; that he will draw all men to himself; that he will subdue all things to his authority; that every tongue shall confess him to be Lord, and the like. Dr. Farrar has made a *catena* of them extending through half a dozen pages. If there were no positive assertions limiting probation, and making conduct in this life the ground of the final decision, it would, perhaps, be natural to accept the apparent meaning as the true one, to be realized, however, under a different system from that which God has framed. But there are such assertions, and to them these passages, rightly interpreted, are in no way antagonistic. They set forth the divine side of the plan of salvation, but with the full knowledge that there is a human side as well, in which free, responsible man, of his own choice, acting in opposition to God, may defeat his gracious intentions, and gain only eternal ruin for himself, thus destroying a soul for whom Christ died.

With these views the discussion might here close, did not the advocates of future probation call us to a range of argument lying outside of revelation, with the frank confession on the part of some of them that their doctrine cannot be argued from the teachings of Scripture, and must be maintained on other

grounds. There may be bravery in thus assuming to penetrate the counsels of the Infinite respecting the destiny and privileges of men, and to discover his unrevealed purposes and methods of mercy in another world for those who spurn him in this; but if their logic be false and their conclusions baseless, their solid rock will prove but shifting sand. The positions taken fall together under one head, which we will denominate,

I. The philosophical argument for future probation.

Extremes meet here. John Murray, the hyper-Calvinist and the father of American Universalism, who logically extended the decree of absolute and unconditional election to embrace all for whom Christ died, and the Rev. Samuel J. Barrows, the ultra-Liberal, who demands that we "remove the stumbling-block of biblical infallibility,"* strike hands here, and agree that the day of grace for the neglectful and the wicked extends into the next life. Be it noted, however, that the doctrine of probation, which throws the responsibility of the sinner's damnation upon himself, is not known to pure Calvinism. That system, by its principle of necessity, takes away his freedom of choice and action, except in the direction in which he is compelled to choose and act, and thus relieves him of all responsibility for his conduct or destiny, and puts it upon God. It makes him a mechanical non-probationer, unrewardable and unpunishable, and then, with a justice equaled only by its reasonableness, remorselessly dooms him to perdition for what he cannot help. Murray's extension of election to include all men, because Christ died for all men, while it does something to relieve the imputation upon the character of a holy God, also leaves man with no proper probation. But both Calvinism and Universalism have become so far removed from their original forms that their founders, were they to re-appear on earth to-day, would not recognize them; and "the progressive orthodoxy" of the former has in "the drift of modern thought," to use Dr. Atwood's expression, gone so far toward the adoption of the theories of the latter that they both agree in the impossibility of vindicating the divine character in giving to every man a fair chance, if probation is limited to this life. Dr. Atwood, as reported in "The Independent," said truly, in the Universalist General Convention in October last,

* "The Doom of the Majority of Mankind," p. 146.

that "the principles of the new orthodoxy are akin to Universalism," though he was compelled to confess it "apparent that, on the part of the leaders of that movement, there is a studious attempt not to recognize the Christian standing and work of the Universalist Church." But let him not be cast down by this unreadiness to acknowledge the kinship, for it needs only the adoption of Dr. Dorner's inability to pronounce dogmatically upon the doctrine of eternal punishment because of human freedom, to place them in the same line. The laws of the oscillation of the psychological pendulum are very certain, and have many illustrations. Dr. Farrar, the freshest and most vigorous living advocate of continued probation, was educated in the school of rigid Calvinism, and in the reaction has gone to the other extreme. Dr. Newman Smyth, a Presbyterian, is now among the foremost in the ranks of the advanced orthodoxy. And the New England Theology, whose adamantine walls once towered so proudly and grandly, is razing its own fortress, and, revolting from itself, is following the revolt of years ago into the happy Elysium of Liberalism. Professor Fisher, of Yale College, bore testimony in "The New Englander" six years ago that, as a historical fact, in the wake of modified Calvinism a belief in restoration and kindred doctrines was springing up. It was not a Methodist, but Professor Park, who, a few months ago, sorrowfully wrote: "I must say that on some of our essential doctrines, as, for example, the doctrine of probation, we must look to our Methodist brethren for light and guidance. On this truth they are sounder than we are; and if it had been told to our fathers sixty years ago that this young denomination would be more orthodox than the Congregationalists, our fathers would have died before their time." Let us hope that the swinging of the pendulum will finally bring our brethren to the solid Methodist ground that every human being who has intelligence enough to be accountable has a probation, and a sufficient probation, in this life.

Dr. Dorner's double standard painfully illustrates the mischief of substituting philosophy for Scripture in the construction of his system. "That some are damned," he says, "rests on preponderant exegetical grounds, but that gives no dogmatic proposition, because this must be derived also from the

principle of faith." * A theology based upon Scripture would lead him conclusively to the doctrine of eternal punishment, but he does not accept it because it does not accord with his previously formed ideas of the absolute Christianity, or, as he terms it, "the principle of faith." This double basis of Scripture and faith, in which the former is frequently compelled to yield to the latter, pervades his whole theological system. So Dr. Smyth admits "Dorner's dogmatic hesitancy when he finds himself unable to reconcile facts of history, or texts of Scripture, with that which faith has already learned to deem Christlike and most worthy of God." Beautiful as this is, it casts us all adrift upon a sea of uncertainties. What we find in Holy Writ we are not to embody in our theology until we have tested it by some previously settled principle. But who shall define for us what is "Christlike and most worthy of God?" Shall it be John Wesley, or John Calvin, or Theodore Parker? Or, shall every man be his own judge and hold himself at liberty to refuse from his acceptance whatever in Scripture does not harmonize with his conception of what is like Christ and worthy of God? This notion of what is becoming God, differing in different men, may, as facts most clearly show, become so greatly changed in the same individual that what was but yesterday proclaimed as truth is in "the progress in theology" to-day rejected as error. Very pertinent here is the remark of Dr. Newman Smyth, that "the feeling of God's being and nature is never fully taken up into any one conception of him, and the religious feeling acts and reacts upon us in a twofold manner, both leading us constantly to think of God, and causing us to become soon dissatisfied with our best thoughts of him. Theology must, therefore, be a progressive science." † And whither it may progress and what may prove its goal, with faith, the religious feeling, or the spiritual intuition, by whichever name it be called, as the arbiter of doctrine, no man can tell. Thus Dorner's principle, that "those views are to be rejected which prevent faith," is practically identical with that of Barrows, namely, this: "We must decline to accept as authoritative any interpretation of the Bible, be it true or false, which affronts the moral sense of

* "The Future State," p. 127.

† "The Religious Feeling," p. 166.

humanity or impugns the righteousness of God." * The most ultra of Liberalists ought to be satisfied with either.

Dorner's argument that human freedom stands in opposition to eternal punishment, and that "so long as freedom of any kind exists, so long the possibility of conversion is not excluded, though it be through judgment and damnation to deep, long-woe," is precisely the argument with which Universalism has long made us familiar. It assumes that the moral government of God will be administered in the next world in the same way that it is in this; that probation continues beyond the present life, and even so long as human freedom exists; that the atonement of Christ, though spurned here, will avail as richly in hell as it does on earth; that the gracious aid of the Holy Spirit to repentance and faith, refused by men here, will be freely given there, and that the agencies devised by infinite wisdom to awaken slumbering souls and bring them to Christ in this world, such as the preaching of the Gospel, the strivings of the Spirit, and the example and influence of the good, will be perpetuated in the world to come. Indeed, it is assumed by some that God has in reserve a higher system of agencies which he will there employ for the recovery of those who under the present one die impenitent, although it would seem beyond conception that there can be a higher dispensation than this in which God himself becomes incarnate, manifests to men the full excellence of his character, reveals to them his will, and then by the sufferings and blood of the cross pays the price of their redemption, and in which the Omnipotent Holy Spirit is the minister of salvation to all who will consent to be saved. Infinite love can provide no greater sacrifice, nor can it more clearly manifest itself than it has done; and the only obstacle to its winning all men to its embrace is in the hostile human will.

Over against these assumptions, which not only have no authority in Scripture, but are contrary to it, lies the fact of the distinctive effect of persistent sin. God deals, and will forever deal, with man in accordance with the laws of the nature which he has given him. By one of those laws, the soul that does not turn to righteousness must grow more and more into worldliness and sin. Beginning with simple neglect of the

* "The Doom of the Majority," p. 140.

Gospel, with the continuance of neglect it loses power to receive it, and absorbs from the world around a thousand influences which tend to harden it against the call of God, to deaden its susceptibilities to its own need, and to perpetuate neglect to the end. Character early begins to form, and it solidifies as the years roll on. The influences that can change it lose their power, and it acquires an abiding permanence. Men die very much as they live. There are, doubtless, exceptional cases of genuine death-bed repentance; but, as a rule, the neglecter neglects to the last, the hardened awake to no feeling, the scoffer turns to no prayer. They exhibit no sorrow for sin, no sense of their deep guilt in God's sight, no disposition to holiness, no turning to Christ, no dread of the judgment that awaits them, even if mental unconsciousness does not come upon them before they fairly realize that they must die. And thus do they pass away from the opportunities and influences that have here been inefficacious, carrying with them the characters which they have formed, and which, by the law of our nature, will abide and strengthen. The knowledge of approaching death and coming retribution has failed to arouse them to repentance, and, unless the laws of man's being become entirely changed, there is no reason to suppose that the entrance upon the dread reality will awaken them to a loathing of sin. Nor is the habit of sin to be so easily broken. The longer one lives in sin the stronger do its bonds become, and the harder is it to break them. Every succeeding year increases the chances against him, and there is no reason to suppose that the sinner of fifty years will be more disposed to repent, or find it easier, when he is fifty thousand, and in the atmosphere of hell.

Besides all this, there is the law of self-produced inability. Men close their eyes to the light, and destroy their power to see. They shut their ears to the truth, and lose their power to hear. They refuse obedience, and become unable to obey. They harden their hearts, and settle down in their hardness. A chosen persistence in sin induces in the soul an inability to repent. This is an old truth. Jeremiah discerned it when he said, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." Jer. xiii, 23. A more sad illustration of it cannot be

found than in the Jews of Christ's time, of whom it is written, "Though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him: . . . therefore they could not believe." John xii, 37–39. First, they *did not;* then they *could not.* Thus is it always. Opportunity squandered diminishes power; and too often, it is to be feared, in the full blaze of Gospel light, power for repentance dies away, though earthly life may still be prolonged. Another probationary trial for such souls would be the offer of a chance for repentance to those who have no power to repent, and so a useless mockery.

But may not God, in a probation extended beyond this life, even though there be no higher dispensation of love and mercy, through the sufferings that befall them, recover the impenitent and rebellious to repentance and holiness? It is claimed that all punishment is disciplinary and remedial, from which arises the hope that some, at least, if not all, will be brought to God in the future world who prove incorrigible in this. But let us not confound the punishment inflicted as penalty with a father's chastisement of his erring child intended for his correction, or with what follows sin as natural consequence. That God does in various ways administer discipline in this world, as by afflictions and trials, is involved in the idea of this life as a state of probation, and is by no means to be forgotten; but that he will do it in another implies that his moral government will in a world of retribution be the same as it is in a world of probation, which has never yet been proved. Again, if one thrusts his hand into a blazing fire he is burned, which follows as natural consequence. A murderer's remorse is a consequence of his crime, but his punishment is the judicially pronounced and inflicted sentence of the law. In like manner, sin has its natural consequence in the soul's defilement; but God's punishment, over and above all natural result, is infliction by his own hand as legal penalty for transgression.

Now, in the face of much of the humanitarian philosophy of the day, we deny the tendency of penal suffering to reform the criminal. The records of criminal history amply sustain this view. Punish, and do nothing more, and the thief continues a thief, with a more intense hatred of the law and of society. "Our observation," remarks Dr. F. H. Hedge, whose

position would naturally incline him to the contrary view, "does not detect this medicinal quality in the penal sufferings of the present life." And Edmund Burke, no light observer of men and things, says, "The infliction of penalty has no tendency to reform the guilty." Men do, indeed, come forth from prison and punishment reformed, but it is because of the agencies for that purpose which Christian benevolence, through the State or privately, has gathered around them. The labor of chaplains, Sunday-school teachers, Scripture readers, pious visitors, and others, which is altogether outside of the penalty imposed, is to be credited with the change in character and life of the not absolutely incorrigible, which is wrongly attributed to the punishment itself. Nor is there reason to suppose that punishment in the future world will have a different tendency from what it has in this. There are no reformatory agencies in hell. The only glimpse vouchsafed to us into the dread prison-house discloses a sufferer whose day of grace was past, with none around him to mitigate his pain, and calling, but in vain, for a ministrant from paradise to cool his tongue. Punishment is the operation of retributive justice upon offenders, the prime purpose of which is the vindication of law and the maintenance of government. In the case of lost souls, it falls upon those who in their day of trial so resist the influences of grace that they become confirmed in their evil courses, sinning on in spite of all reproofs and chastisements, and who, it may be well supposed, would sin on in the midst of suffering forever.

An appeal is made to the perfections of God, to his hatred of evil, his power to destroy it, and his infinite love and pity for sinners, as though in a system of probation continued in the next life he could accomplish what is not attainable here. Such conceptions bear the mark of all the arguments which demand for sinners another chance; they are concerned in putting the responsibility of the sinner's ruin on God if he fail to do something more, while the real responsibility is on the sinner himself for his use of what God has actually done. Let us be well assured that in a purpose and plan of salvation devised by his infinite wisdom no shadow can fall upon the perfections of his nature through the perverseness of those who reject its gracious benefits. The height and depth and breadth

of his love cannot be more fully shown than they have been in the sufferings and shame of his dear Son on the cross. His hatred of evil is proved and illustrated by the price he has paid for our deliverance from it. His power to destroy it or to stop men's sinning if he will, is a false putting of the case, for the existence or destruction of sin is no more a question of power than was its beginning. In the nature of things a square cannot be a circle, nor can two plus two equal five. In the nature of things he could not create man intelligent, moral, and free, and at the same time by an act of omnipotence prevent his sinning. And if omnipotence cannot prevent it in this world, without destroying man's freedom, which God will never do until he contradicts himself, how can he by any exercise of it, short of the annihilation of the sinner, prevent it in the future world? It is in the power of man, confirmed in sin and hardened in obstinacy, to perpetuate it forever. Take away his freedom and he is man no longer, and if saved by an act of divine power he is saved, not as a moral being, but as a machine.

Let it not be feared that evil shall win the victory, and ultimately triumph over God. The struggle is a long one and hard, but the battle was joined and the result determined when Christ was enthroned as universal King. Men come and go with the ages, and as they pass he is set before them that they may bow the knee at his name and confess him Lord. Multitudes have come to adore him, and other multitudes will not have him reign over them. Skeptics sneer, infidels scoff, and "the heathen rage," exalting themselves in their pride, while believing souls, freely accepting him, find their fullest joy at his feet. And thus will it go on until the final consummation. In that dread day his method will change. The hour for rule and the rod of iron and his mighty arm will have come. Rebellion and resistance will be vain. His omnipotent voice, no longer pleading, but now commanding, sinners will be compelled to obey, and whatever power in earth or in hell has exalted itself against him will be subdued. Saints will gather lovingly around him, and wicked men, still impenitent and hard, will at his bidding depart from his presence forever. Satan will be dethroned. Evil will still hate, but, willing or unwilling, all rule and all authority and power throughout the universe shall be under Christ's feet, and God supreme be all in all.

II. The probationary condition of the heathen.

As the Jews denied salvation to the Gentiles, so has the Christian Church, especially from the time of Augustine, adopting the maxim, *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus*, "No salvation outside of the visible Church," denied it to the heathen, and until a recent day this has been the almost universal opinion. "Romanism and Lutheranism," says Dr. Schaff, "save those only who are brought into contact with the Church and the sacraments, [and] Calvinism those only who are elect from eternity." The Westminster Assembly, in its Confession, allows the heathen a "much less" chance of salvation than it does those who hear the Gospel and disobey it, and in its Larger Catechism says: "They who, having never heard the Gospel, know not Jesus Christ, and believe not in him, cannot be saved, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature or the law of that religion which they profess; neither is there salvation in any other, but in Christ alone, who is the Saviour of his body, the Church."

Zwingli broke in upon this horrid nightmare of doom with his declared conviction that together with the two Adams, the redeemed and the Redeemer, Abel, Enoch, the host of Old Testament saints, and Peter and Paul, will be gathered Hercules, Theseus, Socrates, Aristides, Antigonus, Numa, Camillus, the Catos, the Scipios; "in short," he says, "there has been no good man, there will be no holy mind, there is no faithful soul, whom you may not see there with God." Luther's reply, "If this be true, the whole Gospel is false," only expresses the general sentiment of his time.

Thus the old orthodoxy damns the heathen without a probation, and the new fails to do any better, except in the assumption of a probation in the next life. And Dr. Smyth was constrained to admit before the New Haven Council of Installation that "there is nothing definite in the Scripture with regard to a possible future probation," and that "so far as its possibility is concerned it is a speculation." * This dwindles the chance of the heathen to the thinnest of shadows. It is more than possible that if, instead of beginning its inquiries at Geneva and Westminster, as has been so often done with like result, the new orthodoxy had begun at the Arminian point of

* Verbatim Report in "The Independent," Sept. 28, 1882.

the compass, it would have long since emerged into clear sunshine without its present troubles and perils. But, notwithstanding its disadvantages, it has came to hold, according to Dr. Smyth, "that obligation and ability are commensurate; that no man is guilty before personal choice; that man is accordingly by nature still capable of probation; that a moral person can be reprobated only upon the ground of personal determination in evil; and that the atonement was made for the whole world, and all men are to be finally judged by God in view of the sufficiency of Christ's sufferings." * This so-called "improved Calvinism," from which Calvin is left out, evolved through vast labors and throes and proclaimed as new light in a great darkness, is just about what Methodists have been preaching up and down the world for a century and a half. Why, now, when we come to apply these principles to the question of the salvation of the heathen, turn about and flatly contradict them by making obligation exceed ability, and accountability extend beyond opportunity? Yea, rather, why renounce them for the husks of Westminster, in which there is no salvation for those who have never heard of Christ?

Most assuredly, there is no salvation outside of the atonement of Christ. But the atonement is one thing, and its application is another. By his acceptance of it, God is enabled to act in saving men upon such terms as seem to him wise and good, but in the bestowment of its benefits he has never bound himself to treat all men as if living in the same dispensation of truth and grace, or standing upon the same plane of intelligence. The one all-embracing condition for responsible men is a solemn belief in and self-surrender to him, but he has never ordained that all men of every age must believe in Christ, or even that the atonement shall never avail for a human being unconditionally. It would be neither Christlike nor worthy of God to require actual faith in Christ of one who never heard of him. The divine rule of responsibility is, "Unto whom much is given, of him shall be much required;" and the human rule differs not from it: "To whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more." Luke xii, 48. Responsibility equals advantage. Our Saviour's illustration (verses 47, 48) is very clear: "That servant, which knew his

* Introduction to "Dorner on the Future State," p. 34.

Lord's will," who was in charge of affairs and whose enjoined duty was preparedness and watchfulness, "and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. But he that knew not, and did things worthy of stripes," who had received no special orders and yet did as he knew he ought not, "shall be beaten with few stripes," for his guilt was less. "Yea, doubtless," pithily says John Goodwin, "had not this servant been in a capacity of knowing his Lord's will, in case he had been duly inquisitive after it, he had not been beaten with any stripes at all, though he had committed such things which had been worthy of stripes in other men." So, in the parable of the talents, the accountability is measured by the trust, five, two, or one; and had there been a servant to whom nothing was given, he would have been a non-probationer and called to no account.

The inequalities of advantage among different people at the same time and the same people at different times constitute an important element in a judgment in which exact justice is to be done in every case. God bestows his gifts of grace as it pleases him, but holds the recipient responsible only according to the gift. He granted light and means of salvation to the Hebrew which he withheld from the Egyptian, to the Englishman which are not given to the Patagonian, and to Jerusalem in Christ's time which it had not in David's time. Cities and countries have shut their eyes to the light, and judicial darkness has enveloped the generations following. "For judgment," said Jesus, "I am come into this world, that they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind." John ix, 39. Advantage may be abused, as by Chorazin and Bethsaida, and increased advantage may only result in greater condemnation, as in Jerusalem. "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin, but now they have no cloak for their sin." John xv, 22. And with inferior advantage, as in Rahab, may exist the disposition to so use the truth known as to win acceptance with God. And we may be sure that his judgment will take full cognizance of the opportunity and ability possessed, and the requirement will exactly correspond to the gift.

Men every-where have a knowledge of God which, however small it may be, is always sufficient to leave them "without

excuse" if they disobey him. The eternal Logos gives light to every man that cometh into the world. All nature proclaims him, so that from his works what is knowable of him, his power, supremacy, righteousness, and will is shown to them to whom he has not revealed himself by his word. A traditional knowledge of him, as revealed in the first ages, has gone into all religions, and in the polytheisms the most debasing and the farthest departed from the truth is a conception of the Supreme Deity; and the Holy Spirit, whose office is with the conscience, to reprove sin and awake to righteousness, has never, from the day of Adam until now, been absent from the world. Thus God has not left himself without sufficient witness. Cultured Athens erected its altar to the "Unknown God," the Infinite One, whose offspring, as Cleanthes said, we are; and the Scandinavian skald in the Elder Edda sang of a Supreme, mightier than Odin, whom he "dare not venture to name." In all heathendom there is a recognition of God as supreme, though the conception of him may be widely different from the character of Jehovah made known in the Bible, and also of a law binding on the conduct. And both reason and conscience require that as they see and know God they shall serve and obey him. Not to do so is sin.

St. Paul teaches (Rom. ii, 6–16) that men will be rewarded according to their deeds as tested by the law given to them. The possessor of God's written law will be judged by it, and the heathen by "the law written in their hearts," which, though imperfectly, it may be, points for them the path of righteousness and duty. And a true and acceptable obedience to this law as discovered by the conscience requires a genuine faith in God as discerned by the understanding.

This strictly accords with the principle of faith as the appointed condition of acceptance with God. A true faith grasps God as the mind knows him; and when the personal Jesus is made known it will grasp God in Christ, and cannot until then. For faith has its degrees corresponding to the several dispensations of truth and grace. Thus there is a patriarchal faith, a Jewish faith, a Christian faith, and a heathen faith, each being a true faith in God as he is apprehended. So "Abraham believed God" as Supreme, Protector, and Promiser, with only the dimmest conception of a Redeemer; and his faith "was

counted to him for righteousness." Rom. iv, 3. The harlot Rahab, the devotee of Ashtaroth, believed in Jehovah as Conqueror and Supreme, and is ranked among the heroines of faith. The disciples' faith while Christ was with them was a true faith, but it rose no higher than his kingship of men until his ascension. And a Christian faith grasps God manifest in the flesh, the Redeemer and Saviour, which was not possible until the Pentecost. St. Paul defines the lowest form of acceptable faith in Heb. xi, 6: "He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him." Mr. Wesley styles it the faith of a heathen. Beyond doubt, multitudes among the heathen have such a faith, and in their dim light grope after God. Such was Cornelius, who sought after him and found him as the Jehovah of Israel. It was in his experience that St. Peter learned the broad truth that "God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him [as he is made known] and worketh righteousness [as its law is discerned] is accepted with him." This is the divine rule, though, as in the case of Cornelius, Christ be not known. In Christian lands, God as revealed in Christ as Saviour and Son must be believed and obeyed. In Mohammedan and pagan lands, where the Gospel does not shed its light, souls that believe and seek God as he is revealed to them are saved. The genuineness of the centurion's faith was proved by the glad heartiness with which it embraced Christ on the preaching of the apostle; and so, doubtless, many a pagan, worshiping imperfectly, and in forms and ways that the Bible disapproves, but sincerely fearing and serving God as best he knows, is accepted with him, and on presentation of the Gospel will welcome it as did Cornelius. We cannot quite say, with Joseph Cook, that such souls do believe in the "essential Christ," for of such a Christ we have no knowledge, while the Christ set forth for our faith is very real and definite. And besides, the real question relates not, as Mr. Cook seems to think, to the perfectness of the object of faith, but to the perfectness of the faith itself in the object as discerned. He is evidently not yet free from the trammles of Westminster.

It follows from what has been said, that in the atonement provision is made for all the race; that opportunity and ability are the measure of accountability; that, through Christ, a

sufficient light and knowledge are given to the heathen whereby they may be saved; that none will be condemned except for their willful rejection of the truth vouchsafed to them; that some do in their relative darkness truly believe in God, and are accepted with him; and, therefore, that a new probation in which to obtain mercy is not needed.

"But if the heathen may be saved, why send them the Gospel, whose added light will increase their responsibility?" For the same reason that we preach it at home, though knowing that to some it will be "the savor of death unto death"—to save men. For the same reason that ministers and Churches, by continued revival services, seek to arouse and bring to Christ those who are neglecting salvation — to save more. For the reason that there, just as here, the great multitude will neglect the truth they have and press on in sin, except good men persistently seek their rescue.

III. Infant non-probation.

The demand for a probation in the next world, for those who die in infancy, has its root in the dogma of infant damnation. Augustine assigned all unbaptized infants to hell, the mildest part of it, to be sure, "but, nevertheless," he says, "they are damned." In this he is followed by the Roman Catholic Church. On this theory the overwhelming majority of those that die in infancy are lost. According to the "Westminster Confession," "Elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when and where he pleaseth." Of course, the non-elect are damned, "to the praise of his glorious justice;" but either by baptism or the eternal election of God millions of infants are saved. The new orthodoxy, rejecting these methods, demands that every infant that dies shall be subjected to a decisive probation in the next world. This is monstrous, if it be not necessary for salvation; and if it is necessary, the dying infant is unsaved. If any are shocked at such a conclusion, let them remember the fundamental principles of individual responsibility and the necessity of actual faith in Christ of every human being in order to salvation. Dr. Smyth expressly mentions infants, idiots, and "children born apparently to no moral chance," as among those for whom he trusts God for "some special opportunity for repentance in Hades," holding it to be "a logical deduction

from the biblical principle of individual accountability under a general atonement which has been maintained in our New England theology." And if there be no such opportunity for the repentance of those who have nothing to repent of, this new theology, less merciful than either Romanism or pure Calvinism, notwithstanding its pretensions to nobler conceptions of God, finds no escape from the horribleness of a universal infant damnation.

This notion of infant accountability transcends common sense, for there can be no responsibility where there is and can be no knowledge or power. In so far as the attempt is to *create* an accountability to accommodate a preconceived theory of a necessity of a probation for infants, it goes beyond what God has revealed, and beyond what necessity requires as well. Those Methodist thinkers who anxiously invent a supernatural enlightenment by the Holy Spirit of the infant soul as it is about to depart, that it may believe in Christ, may well reflect whether faith is imposed as the condition of salvation upon any one who is innocent of personal sin. The gracious opportunities and tests of probation are for sinners who, by their own acts, have become personally guilty in order that they may, if they will, accept the offered mercy. But such a probation is impossible to an infant, for he has incurred no guilt and needs no pardon for sin which he has never committed, and, therefore, no believing in order to salvation. He is in the plan of God a non-probationer, without knowledge, law, obligation, power, or responsibility. Moreover, it is time to take exception to this exaltation of an expressive technical term of comparatively recent origin to be the basis of a new theological dogma. We find in the Scriptures that to intelligent and responsible human sinners grace is offered upon conditions within their power, on the performance or non-performance of which their destiny depends; and this for convenience' sake we call *probation*. The term is good for just what it is meant for, and nothing more. Least of all does this use of it warrant the foisting upon it as doctrinal truth inferences deduced from the word itself, and thus creating a need of an infant probation which it proceeds to supply. Such handling of Christian truth cannot be too severely reprobated.

The innocence of the infant does not of itself furnish an

adequate ground for his salvation. Its true ground is to be sought in his relation to Christ. By his relation to Adam he has inherited a fallen, depraved nature, which is not his fault, and for which, on no principle of just dealing, can he be held responsible, but which is, nevertheless, displeasing and offensive to God, because contrary to his own most holy nature. Abstractly viewed, it shuts him out of heaven and shuts him up in hell, which involves so monstrous an injustice that it is not conceivable that a holy God could allow a child to be born into the world without providing an antidote fully equal to the evil. So, over against this "corruption of the nature of every man" he has graciously placed the atonement of Christ, which is a "perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual." If, then, by Adam's sin the race was placed in the position of sinners, by Christ's atonement we are recovered from our displacency, accepted of God, and made heirs of eternal life. Through Christ we come into the world free from condemnation, saved, and children of the heavenly kingdom. "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." This involves not only an external relation, but an inward character as well, fashioned and made pleasing to God by the indwelling Holy Spirit. If the former be justification, the latter is regeneration, or what would be so termed in an adult. *And this is salvation.* In this condition infants are started in their career to retain it until death, or until voluntarily forfeited by sin. If they die, there can be no question of whither they go; they are transplanted to the paradise of God, for whose sweet fields they are so beautifully fitted. To thrust in here upon already saved souls a probation to test their willingness to be saved would seem to be the climax of absurdity. If, on the other hand, they live, and in the fight with temptation fall into sin and forfeit their saved state, what then? Truly, this, and not the question of infants, idiots, and other irresponsibles who die, is the difficult problem, and no man could solve it had not Christ spoken. By his shed blood he has the right to offer them conditionally a restoration to what had been before bestowed unconditionally and lost; and to all such as can hear it he sends the message of his Gospel, *Come unto me, and be ye saved.*

That Christ, on the infant's entrance into paradise, is made

known to him, cannot be doubted; not, however, for acceptance or rejection, which belongs only to probation and involves the idea of contingency which can have no place there, but for recognition, adoration, and love. With the penitent thief and multitudes of untrained and untaught Christians, the infant will learn the great truths and mysteries of God, and sweetly join in the glad song of redemption. But this is not probation. Growth and development there will be, but not change of destiny.

IV. The awards of the Day of Judgment a finality.

"He hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained." Acts xvii, 31. The date of this general judgment of mankind is not revealed, nor are the elements for its calculation given; but we are told that it will occur in connection with the second advent, the resurrection of the dead, and the winding up of this world's history. It is eminently fitting that the rewards and punishments connected with the moral government of the world should be administered at the closing up of the present order of things, and that the transaction should be a public one. The probationary system will then close. The gathering of its results privately would be unseemly, and not after God's usual method. Its administration is in the sight of angels and men; its vindication will be in the presence of the assembled universe. Problems of God's providential dealings that can here be met only with faith in his wisdom, justice, and love will then be solved, and all doubters, murmurers, and complainers be covered with confusion. Besides, sin has not confined itself to a corner or to darkness. It has shown its work openly, exalting itself in hostility to all goodness, and flaunting its defiant rebellion in the face of Omnipotence. The alternate victories and defeats in the war of good and evil must come to an end in a way that will to all intelligences show the latter prostrate and powerless in the grasp of the Almighty. So open and public must be the gathering out of the race of sinners of those who are saved, and so manifestly must they be seen to have been washed from their sins in the blood of Jesus, that no tongue in all the universe can ever accuse the Judge of injustice or lack of goodness in damning, or of partiality in saving. Such a consummation leaves nothing

for subsequent review, and can have no repetition. It will be a finality.

The nature of that day as a day of judgment for men leads to the same result. Our Saviour (Matt. xxv, 31–46) vividly describes the scene, in which he will be seated on his judgment-throne, with angels for his attendants, and all mankind arrayed before him. Unlike the constant divine discrimination now of human conduct is this of the great day for absolute decision upon determined moral character. The tribunal is a judicial tribunal; the inquiry is a judicial inquiry into the testimony of the opened books; the decisions are judicial decisions; the awards are judicial awards, and at the lips of an infallible Judge. Judicial awards are always of force *until they are judicially reversed*; and from these lies no appeal. There is no higher tribunal; there is no second day of judgment: the sentence pronounced is irrevocable.

But if perchance the sinner be by the agonies of his punishment awakened to repentance, may not a merciful God, notwithstanding this judicial condemnation, hear his cry and deliver him from his woe? This implies that character which is determined at or before death may change in hell; that probation continues beyond the judgment as it is in this life; that the judgment of the great day is only an advance step in God's dealings with men; that the mediatorial government of Christ will continue beyond its close in the delivering up of the kingdom to the Father; that the consummation is not the consummation; and that the King and Judge who pronounces the irreversible doom, foreknowing the future repentance and granting of mercy, will contradict himself by its abrogation in the exercise of his sovereignty. Failure in any one of these points is failure in all. Hope of rescue in hell can be only endless despair.

The awards of the judgment, "Come, ye blessed," and "Depart from (*ἀπό*) me," are as opposite as are the characters addressed, and are both eternal. "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." Union with Christ in the heavenly kingdom forever is for the one; separation from Christ in punishment forever is for the other. Notwithstanding Dr. Farrar's sneer at it as a "stock sophism from the days of Augustine," we must hold that any

limitation of *αἰώνιος* in the punishment of the wicked applies equally to the happiness of the righteous.

A second passage, the only additional one to which we can refer, is 2 Thess. i, 9: "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." This is the penalty on persecuting heathen and unbelieving Jews when Christ shall come "rendering vengeance" to them. Stern as is this expression, it is the right one, eliminating from our conception of it every thing of the humanly capricious and passionate. It means *maintenance of right*, and so, penal satisfaction for injury, or retribution. Christ, then, will award the retribution demanded by justice. In verse 6 we read, "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you." We are brought face to face with the divine justice, and St. Paul, contrary to the sentimentalism of punishment solely for correction, asserts that it is a just thing with God to pay in kind—tribulation for tribulation, affliction for affliction. Indeed, this is the law of justice—like for like. It pervades all government, human and divine. It is in the institutions of the theocracy, and the New Testament is full of justice and retribution, while the rule for individual action without process of law is that of love and tenderness. In this view, these wicked people are to be "punished," that is, literally, to *pay a penalty*, and that penalty is "eternal destruction from (*ἀπό*) the presence [or face] of God, and from (*ἀπό*) the glory of his power." The "destruction" is not annihilation. The sinner, separate from God, unbuilds, pulls down, and brings to naught all God's plans for him. He destroys himself while yet living on the earth, and in that day God will destroy him, perpetuating the separation from himself and his plans forever. This is eternal destruction. The preposition employed shows separation in locality. Here, then, we have the consequent of the sentence of the Judge, "Depart from me, ye cursed." Attending angels, the ministers of his power, enforce his words, separating the condemned from his face and his glory, and bearing them away to their eternal prison, where they are forever shut out from God and all goodness and shut in with all evil.

The use of *αἰώνιος* we had planned to discuss, but our limit

of space forbids. We can only refer to some remarks in this Quarterly for April, 1878, from the scholarly pen of Professor W. S. Tyler, and give the following from the late Professor Tayler Lewis:

> The *single* terms (*olam* and *alών*) do not of themselves, or necessarily, denote *endless*, but simply unmeasured duration. It should be borne in mind, however, that it is by their fearful reduplications the scriptural writers express that idea which no single noun, unless it be an abstract negative, can fully set forth. But what the single noun fails to do is accomplished by the adjective *alώνιος*, as a term of *greatest measurement*. . . . *Æonian* duration is that which is measured by æons, ages, worlds, or eternities, just as finite periods are measured by years and centuries, and are therefore called *centennial*, *millennial*, etc. There being no greater unit of measurement than the *olam*, there is no limit to the conception of the *whole* which it measures or divides. In this way the adjective comes to denote absolute eternity, as is put beyond all doubt by its use, 2 Cor. iv, 18. It is there the *antithesis* of the *temporal*, and can have no measurable bound.*

These words from this eminent scholar amply offset the opinion of Drs. Smyth and Whiton, which they seem to have borrowed from F. D. Maurice, that *alώνιος* is not a word of duration. Its import of endlessness proves the finality of the judgment doom pronounced on evil conduct in this life.

The thought of the eternal ruin of a human soul without remedy or hope is appalling. Nor is there relief in the knowledge that it is self-produced by willful persistence in chosen sin in spite of all God's efforts to save him. Look at it as we will, it is terrible. And a free, full, and sufficient probation for every man, in which the means of salvation are urgently placed before him for acceptance, and none is rejected except for his rejection of mercy, is God's sufficient and perfect vindication.

*"The Six Days of Creation," p. 366.

Art. VIII.—THE GNOMIC AORIST IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The best known and most elaborate New Testament grammar* now extant denies the existence of this form of Greek usage in the New Testament. On the other hand, an authority no less eminent for Greek grammatical scholarship † admits this mode of expression in the grammar of the New Testament, and gives a few examples of its use. The contradictory views, expressed by grammarians so eminent, allow the inference that the question is not settled, and that any contribution on such a subject, even viewed as a matter of philological inquiry, is not without value.

When, however, the usage is one which has its application in some of the life-truths of the New Testament, it becomes not only a scholastic delight, but a duty, to investigate the topic. Neither of the grammarians referred to—Winer or Buttmann—have made any use of it in its bearing on difficult exegetical problems. An inquiry into this usage is not out of place, especially if it can be shown to have an application to some interesting and difficult passages of Holy Scripture.

The accuracy of the Greek language in the expression of the finer shades of meaning is too well known to need special argument. It is this which gave to it such a wonderful adaptation to convey to mankind the teachings of Christ and his apostles, and it is one of the recognized providential preparations for the Saviour's advent. It is therefore natural to suppose, that although the language at the time of Christ varied largely from Attic purity, it would yet retain those elements of special value for the conveyance of the loftiest thoughts on spiritual things.

It is at this point, however, that Winer makes his strong objection to the existence of the gnomic Aorist in the New Testament. It is in his view a refinement too subtle for the writers of the New Testament. It is well known that some of the finer forms have disappeared. Especially is this the case in the use of the particles. This laxity in the use of

* "A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek," by Dr. G. B. Winer.
† "A Grammar of New Testament Greek," by Alexander Buttman.

particles is not confined to New Testament Greek, but is found also in some of the Attic prose writers.* Other variations are frequent and need not be enumerated. Without claiming for it the character of Attic purity, it is yet a language which, though modified by Hebraisms and other causes, is well calculated to express the rich thoughts which the sacred writers intended to convey.

The question before us is not whether some of the choice forms of expression had passed away at the time when the New Testament was written, but whether this precise form, the gnomic Aorist, had entirely disappeared. It is not necessary to show that it was frequently employed, but that it is clearly found there. The gnomic Aorist is, as will afterward appear, that form of speech which expresses proverbs or general truths, and is of the nature of a pictorial or vivid presentation of a subject. This is precisely the characteristic which belongs to the New Testament, and is especially characteristic of the writings of the apostle Paul. His style is graphic, and partakes often rather of the characteristics of the orator face to face with his audience than of the prose writer dispassionately and methodically discussing his subject. And yet in his most rhetorical flights logic and precision of expression are rigidly maintained.

One of the finest forms of Greek usage is that of conditional sentences. These distinctions are for the most part rigidly maintained. The force of many passages in the writings of Paul is clearly seen by noticing the form of the conditional sentence employed. It is not intended to maintain the exact conformity to classical models, but a general adherence to them. A clear case of this is found in Gal. i, 8–10:

Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζηται ὑμῖν παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. ὡς προειρήκαμεν, καὶ ἄρτι πάλιν λέγω, εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. ἄρτι γὰρ ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν Θεόν; ἢ ζητῶ ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν; εἰ γὰρ ἔτι ἀνθρώποις ἤρεσκον, Χριστοῦ δοῦλος οὐκ ἂν ἤμην.

Here, within the compass of three verses, three out of the four forms of conditional sentences are employed, with clear discrimination of the meanings of them. If the conditional sentence is so well preserved, why not the gnomic Aorist? If

* Buttman, p. 71.

a probability can be established that such will be the case, it will help in the investigation of the passages where it is supposed to be employed. We propose to give a few illustrations of this usage from classical Greek, taken almost at random from examples in classical grammars in common use, and then to inquire into the biblical usage. That it is a common form in Greek, we can readily see by the following citations:

Curtius's Greek Grammar, sec. 494, says:

The Aorist Indicative is used in statements of experience, implying that a thing once happened, but admitting an application to all times: poet. *τῷ χρόνῳ ἡ δίκη πάντως ἦλθ' αποτσαμένη*, with time avenging justice always came, (*and hence always comes;*) *καὶ βραδὺς εὔβουλος εἶλεν ταχὺν ἄνδρα διώκων*, even a slow man when well advised overtook (*overtakes*) by pursuit a quick man. In English we employ the Present in such general assertions, and often add such adverbs as *usually, commonly, always*, etc.; *τὰς τῶν φαύλων συνουσίας ὀλίγος χρόνος διελυσεν*, a short time usually dissolves the associations of the bad. This Aorist is called the *gnomic* Aorist, because it is often used in gnomes, proverbs, or maxims.

Jelf, sec. 402, 1, says:

As the force of the Aorist may extend over the whole space of past time, without reference to any single definite moment, it is used to express an action which took place repeatedly in past time, or in the statement of some general fact or habitual practice which operated at different indefinite moments of past time.

Goodwin, "Moods and Tenses," sec. 30, 1, says:

The Aorist and sometimes the Perfect Indicative are used in animated language to express *general truths*. These are called the *gnomic Aorist* and the *gnomic Perfect*, and are usually translated by our Present. These tenses give a more vivid statement of general truths by employing a *distinct* case or several distinct cases in past time to represent (as it were) *all possible* cases, and implying that which has occurred *will occur* again under similar circumstances.

These statements, from strictly classical grammars of the Greek language, show how prevalent this usage was among the best authors.

When we come to the New Testament, Winer objects. His language is: "In no passage of the New Testament does the Aorist express an habitual act." *

* Thayer's Translation, pp. 201, 202.

In reply to this we quote at length from "Buttman's Grammar," already mentioned:

According to Moller's exposition, this Aorist, used alike by poets and prose writers of every age, can, indeed, express habitualness; but just as well, and still more frequently, the necessity or universality of an action or state, which does not, like habitualness, permit of exceptions. Since, now, this Aorist was employed for the most part in general propositions deduced from experience—propositions whose contents are valid not only for the past, but also for the present and the future—the title, "Gnomic Aorist," designates more correctly its essential nature.

Its use in Greek occurs not only in similitudes, propositions involving comparisons, (as so often in Homer,) and ideal pictures, (Plato, Phædr., p. 246, *sq.*,) but also in abstract, maxim-like declarations, founded in practical observation. (See the examples from Thucyd. and Demosth., given by Moller.)

When, then, Winer asserts that the Aorist never in the New Testament expresses what is habitual, the assertion is well founded so far forth as the peculiarity of the Aorist in question is not adequately described by the feature of habitualness; but the occurrence of the gnomic Aorist, according to the above description of it, ought at the same time not to be denied. For the objection that the whole idiom presumes too nice an observance of the laws of classic Greek, and greater familiarity with them than can be supposed in the New Testament authors, may perhaps be decisive for a portion of them, but not for all. On the contrary, the employment of the Aorist, as the most common historic tense, corresponds perfectly to the character of popular expression, which so gladly endeavors to break away from the form of abstract presentation, and spontaneously falls into the tone of narration. Observe the form of the Homeric comparisons, or the description of the shield in the Iliad, where, moreover, Imperfects and Aorists continually alternate in the narrative.

If, then, it is evident, from the exposition given, that the New Testament writers, so far forth as their writings, philologically viewed, are products of Greek modes of thought, must have been led by the very nature of the popular language to use this Aorist as a matter of course when occasion occurred, (and the cases would certainly be more numerous if the compass of the books were greater, since with the present compass they are already pretty numerous,) etc.

He sustains this view by the following examples:

James i, 9, *sq.*: *Καυχάσθω δὲ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὁ ταπεινὸς ἐν τῷ ὕψει αὐτοῦ. ὁ δὲ πλούσιος ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου παρελεύσεται. ἀνέτειλε γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος σὺν τῷ καύσωνι, καὶ ἐξήρανε τὸν χόρτον, καὶ τὸ ἄνθος αὐτοῦ ἐξέπεσε, καὶ ἡ εὐπρέπεια τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἀπώλετο· οὕτω καὶ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν ταῖς πορείαις αὐτοῦ μαρανθήσεται.*

The Revised translation reads:

But let the brother of low degree glory in his high estate: and the rich, in that he is made low: because as the flower of the grass he shall pass away. For the sun *ariseth* with the scorching wind, and *withereth* the grass; and the flower thereof *falleth*, and the grace of the fashion of it *perisheth*: so also shall the rich man fade away in his goings.

In the above passage ἀνέτειλε, ἐξήρανε, ἐξέπεσε, and ἀπώλετο are employed as gnomic Aorists, and so recognized by the Revisers.

Further, James i, 23: ὅτι εἴ τις ἀκροατὴς λόγου ἐστὶ καὶ οὐ ποιητής, οὗτος ἐοικεν ἀνδρὶ κατανοοῦντι τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ· κατενόησε γὰρ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀπελήλυθε, καὶ εὐθέως ἐπελάθετο ὁποῖος ἦν.

Revised translation:

For if any one is a hearer of the word, and not a doer, he is like unto a man beholding his natural face in a mirror: for he *beholdeth* himself, and *goeth* away, and straightway *forgetteth* what manner of man he was.

Here the Aorists are similarly translated.

Similar to instance in James i, 11, is 1 Peter i, 24: διότι Πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς χόρτος, καὶ πᾶσα δόξα ἀνθρώπου ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου. ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος, καὶ τὸ ἄνθος αὐτοῦ ἐξέπεσε·

For,
All flesh is as grass,
And all the glory thereof as the flower of grass.
The grass *withereth*, and the flower *falleth*.

From the same source, namely, the requirements of historic presentation, proceed the Aorists in Paul's doctrinal analysis in Rom. viii, 29: οὓς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν· . . οὓς δὲ προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν· καὶ οὓς ἐκάλεσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν; hence it is not necessary to assume that the last Aorist (ἐδόξασεν) differs in force from all the rest.

Finally, the two Aorists in John xv, 6, may also, in part, at least, be included under the head of the gnomic Aorist, inasmuch as the thought contains an experimental truth set forth figuratively, in which the two momentary acts (ἐβλήθη, ἐξηράνθη) come into manifest antithesis to the continuous one denoted by the Present, (συνάγουσιν:) ἐὰν μή τις μείνῃ ἐν ἐμοί, ἐβλήθη ἔξω ὡς τὸ κλῆμα, καὶ ἐξηράνθη, καὶ συνάγουσιν αὐτὰ καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλουσι, καὶ καίεται.

Revised translation:

If a man abide not in me, he *is cast* forth as a branch, and *is withered;* and they gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.

The above examples are taken from Buttman, but we have introduced the Revised translation to show that our recent revisers understood them in the same way.

It thus appears from unquestioned grammatical authority that the gnomic Aorist exists in the New Testament.

It is further to be noticed that the same usage prevails in the Old Testament, affording a further reason why it should be found in the New Testament. It is distinctly recognized by Hebrew grammarians.

Driver, "Use of Tenses in Hebrew," speaking of the Hebrew Perfect, (preterite,) says: "It is used to express general truths known to have actually occurred, and so proved from experience; here again the idiomatic rendering in English is by means of the Present." He also remarks, in note under the Perfect: "Both the Perfect and Aorist (the gnomic Aorist) are similarly used in Greek, that is, to express general truths known to have occurred."

Job xxviii, 8–11, LXX, is an instance: *καὶ οὐκ ἐπάτησαν οὐτὸν υἱοὶ ἀλαζόνων, ὀυπαρῆλθεν ἐπ' αὐτῆς λέων, sq.*

The Hebrew, of special interest, is from the ninth and tenth verses:

בַּחַלָמִישׁ שָׁלַח יָדוֹ הָפַךְ כַּשֹּׁרֶשׁ הָרִים׃ בַּצֻרוֹת יְאֹרִים בָּקָע וְכָל־יְקָר רָאֲתָה עֵינוֹ׃

The lion's whelps have not trodden it, nor the fierce lion passed by it.

He *putteth* forth his hand upon the rock; he *overturneth* the mountains by the roots.

He *cutteth* out rivers among the rocks; and his eye *seeth* every precious thing.

The English translation treats the Greek and Hebrew as instances of the past, with the gnomic meaning.

It will be noticed that in this passage the Hebrew verbs are in the preterite tense and the Greek in the Aorist, while the English translation is in the present tense.

Another instance is found in the first psalm: "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor

standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful." Gesenius* cites this as an instance of the gnomic Aorist. The Hebrew הָלַךְ, עָמַד, יָשַׁב, which are verbs in the Hebrew Preterite, are rendered in the Septuagint by *ἐπορεύθη*, *ἔστη*, *ἐκάθισεν*, and in the English by the Present. So, also, the passage already cited, 1 Peter i, 24, is a quotation from the Septuagint of Isaiah, and shows in the Old Testament and in the New the gnomic characteristics.

Ewald,† also, speaks of the Hebrew Perfect (preterite) as expressing "general truths which are plainly taught, and already fully established by experience," as "*the wicked man*, נָאַץ, *despises God*, and frequently in comparisons and proverbs."

It thus appears that this form of syntax exists both in Greek and Hebrew.‡ It is found in Homer, as well as in the authors who wrote in the most polished period of Greek literature. It belongs, therefore, to the language of the New Testament by right. We may fitly claim that it may legitimately enter into the discussion of such passages of the New Testament as may be affected by it.

If the gnomic Aorist be recognized as a part of the structure of New Testament Greek, it follows that it may be legitimately employed in the exposition of passages which involve doctrinal distinctions as well as in mere historic presentation.

It may be well to begin with a passage in Galatians, chap. ii, 10: *μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι.*

The late Revision translates, "Only *they would* that we should remember the poor; which very thing I was also zealous to do."

What is the nature of the Aorist *ἐσπούδασα*? The apostle, in this part of the epistle, is proving the independence of his apostolic authority, and that although he, with Barnabas, had gone up to Jerusalem, as delegates to the apostolic council, he, nevertheless, had derived no special information from that body which should dictate his teachings. He declares that they had only enjoined upon them the duty of remembering the poor, "which very thing I was also zealous to do." When

* Mitchell's Edition, sec. 126, 3.

† "Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament." Translated by James Kennedy, B.D., p. 5.

‡ See also Green's Hebrew Grammar, sec. 262, 3.

was he zealous to do it? At the point of time when the injunction was delivered, or at a subsequent period? He evidently means to say that on this point he needed no special counsel, as his zeal in this direction was habitual to him. Alford says, "Then and always: it was my habit"—and refers to Rom. xv, 25–27; 1 Cor. xvi, 1–4; 2 Cor. viii, 4; Acts xxiv, 17, as proof of his habitual *σπουδὴ*.

Ellicott finds it difficult to evade the force of Alford's view, and shelters himself behind Winer's denial of this usage in the New Testament. His bent is manifestly towards regarding it as a gnomic Aorist. His language is: "The Aorist is here correctly used, not for the Perfect, (Conybeare,) nor even for the Pluperfect, nor yet exactly as expressing the *habit*, (compare Alford,) this usage being somewhat doubtful in the New Testament, (see Winer, etc.,) but simply an historical fact which belongs to the past, without its being affirmed or denied that it may or may not continue to the present." This distinguished and very accurate grammatical exegete seems here to feel the force of employing this as a gnomic Aorist, but shrinks from adopting in the exposition a usage not sanctioned by the recognized grammatical authority of Winer. The other passages adduced, however, justify the use here, and show that Paul employs the Aorist in this case to assert his habitual zeal in remembering the poor, and hence that the counsel they had received had added nothing to him.

The passages, however, of the greatest importance in this connection are yet to be considered.

Rom. iii, 23, is well worthy of attention in regard to its Aorist. It is, *πάντες γὰς ἡμαρτον, καὶ ὑστεροῦνται της δόξῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ.* This verse is translated in our late Revision, "For all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God." That our revisers have felt a difficulty in the employment of this Aorist, in the usual Aoristic sense, is clear. It was one of the cardinal laws of the Committee to translate tenses uniformly, and they have adhered to their law in the case of the Aorist with great pertinacity. The difficulty of connecting the ordinary sense of the Aorist with the present tense, in the second clause of the sentence, confronted them, and they translate the Aorist by the Perfect. On the other hand, the very same word, in the very same tense, in Rom. v, 12, is translated "sinned," without the "have." If

ἥμαρτον (Rom. iii, 23) should be translated as a gnomic Aorist, the difficulty would be removed, and a plain and simple proposition would result—"All sin, and fall short of the glory of God."

Is not this translation of the Aorist demanded by the context? Paul is aiming to convince the self-righteous Jew, not merely of past sinfulness, but of present transgressions which prevent him from procuring salvation by the works of the law, and hence he urges their present condition as a reason for their acceptance of salvation by grace through faith. (See Tholuck on Romans, l. c.)

Dr. Shedd ("Commentary" on Romans, l. c.) declares, that "the apostle has in mind a particular historical event, the same, namely, with that alluded to in πάντες ἥμαρτον, of chap. v, 12, the sin in Adam," while Tholuck, Meyer, and Phillipi regard the reference of the Aorist to individual transgressions. The force of this Aorist is nowhere, however, more clearly put than by Dr. Whedon, (see "Commentary" on Romans, l. c.,) who declares that "the phrase is tantamount to *all men sin.*" The only point on which we insist here is, that it is the expression of the gnomic usage, a general fact which they could not deny, which the apostle is urging upon their attention. It is not sufficient to claim that their sin is merely that of sinning in Adam, which produced corruption of nature and consequent actual transgressions; for he has discussed, in the first and second chapters of this same epistle, the present condition of Jews and Gentiles, as actual transgressors, and has shown that they cannot extricate themselves from their condition without gracious interposition. It is their habitual state as sinful and sinning that is before the mind of the apostle.

Another important passage is found in Rom. v, 12: Καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. The late Revision translates: "And so death passed unto all men, for that all sinned." As already noticed, they have here preserved a strict Aoristic sense. But is not this also best rendered, as a gnomic Aorist, "for that all sin?"

Having shown that this is a legitimate use of the Aorist in the New Testament, we may well inquire whether it is not the proper and intended use of the Aorist in this particular passage.

The Revisers' translation carries with it the dogmatic inference that all sinned in Adam, and places death as the penalty

of that single sin. Is that the only sin that receives this penalty, or is it the habit of sinning which belongs to man's nature and which is ever working death?

This gnomic usage gives a philological basis to that form of interpretation which has been accepted by so many writers on the theological conceptions of Paul. Dr. Whedon, who has in his "Commentary" stated so clearly the train of thought of the apostle, has forcibly presented the force of the Aorist in several of Paul's passages. The fact, then, that so many writers, including De Wette, Stuart, and Whedon, have given a meaning to this clause which is most natural and in harmony with this usage, is a strong proof that the gnomic Aorist is not foreign to the idiom of the New Testament.

The sixth chapter of Romans is an instance of similar usage of the apostle. We place in connection Rom. vi, 4–9, in Greek, and in the two latest English versions:

Συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ἵνα ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός, οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν. εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου οὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα, τουτο γινώσκοντες, ὅτι ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη, ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτιᾳ, ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ, πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συνζήσομεν αὐτῷ, εἰδότες ὅτι Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνήσκει, θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει.

Therefore we *are buried* with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in the likeness* of *his* resurrection: Knowing this, that our old man *is crucified* with *him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now if *we be dead* with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him: Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him.—*Authorized Version.*

We *were buried* therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with *him* by the likeness of his death, we shall be also *by the likeness* of his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man *was crucified* with *him*, that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in

bondage to sin; for he that hath died is justified from sin. But if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him; knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death no more hath dominion over him.—*Revised Version.*

The early English translations, Wiclif, Tyndale, Rheims, Geneva, translated these Aorists, namely, *συνετάφημεν*, *συνεσταυρώθη*, etc., in a Perfect sense, apparently assured that it was a general fact or experience which the writer was enforcing. The consensus by so many translators as to the meaning of the apostle may serve as a justification of the view that here also he is employing this Aoristic usage.

The passage in Romans viii, 29, 30, is an additional text which claims attention here. The Revised translation is: "For whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brethren: and whom he foreordained, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified." Allusion has already been made to these verses in the reference to Buttman's Grammar. The ordinary method of explaining these Aorists is that of Winer: "In Rom. viii, 30, *ἐδόξασε* is used because he in regard to whom God has accomplished the *δικαιοῦν* has already obtained from him the *δοξάζεσθαί* also, though the reception of the *δόξα* as an actual possession belongs to the future."

It is as if God looked upon the *δόξα* as already accomplished, and that Paul introduced several Aorists in their ordinary sense, and then the last one on the ground indicated by Winer. Is it not better to assume with Buttman that *προέγνω*, *προώρισεν*, *ἐκάλεσεν*, *ἐδικαίωσεν*, *ἐδόξασεν*, are gnomic Aorists, and set forth God's plan of securing the final salvation of his people, which must inevitably bring them to glory? "For whom he foreknows, he foreordains: and whom he foreordains, them he also calls: and whom he calls, them he also justifies: and whom he justifies, them he also glorifies."

It would not be wise to make dogmatic considerations the basis of grammatical laws; nor, on the other hand, should grammatical rules override the plain sense of any passage. Our grammars arose out of a careful study of the meanings of the writings discussed, and not the writings out of the

grammars. Grammar is still a progressive science, and every attempt to add to the meaning of passages through philology cannot be entirely without use.

When we take into consideration that the gnomic Aorist existed through all the ages of Greek literature, from Homer onward, that it is a recognized usage in Hebrew grammarians, and is employed clearly in the Septuagint, that it is supported by the best grammatical authority, and that it is clearly stamped on several New Testament passages, it is impossible not to recognize it as a usage of New Testament Greek grammar, and to give it a wider application than it has thus far received.

ART. IX.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Reviews.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, January, 1884. (Oberlin, Ohio.)—1. Sketches of Pentateuch Criticism: by Rev. Samuel Ives Curtiss. 2. Essential Christianity; by Rev. J. W. Weddell. 3. Immortality and Science; by Prof. James T. Bixby. 4. Proposed Reconstruction of the Pentateuch. 5. Church History as a Science, a Theological Discipline, and a Mode of the Gospel; by Rev. John DeWitt, D.D. 6. Prof. Max Müller on the Origin and Growth of Religion; by Prof. S. H. Kellogg, D.D. 7. Luther and his Work; by Rev. Judson Smith, D.D. 8. Current Periodical Literature. 9. Recent German University Intelligence.

EDUCATION; AN INTERNATIONAL MAGAZINE. Bi-monthly. Devoted to the Science, Art, Philosophy, and Literature of Education. January–February, 1884. (Boston, Mass.)—1. The Normal School Problem, and the Problem of the Schools; by Prof. H. Straight. 2. Manual Training; by Prof. C. M. Woodward. 3. Notes on the Origin of the Italian Language; by W. C. Wilde. 4. The Function of the Normal School; by E. C. Hewett, LL.D. 5. Music in Public Schools; by Prof. H. E. Holt. 6. The Teacher's Influence. 7. What has been Done for Education by the Government of the United States; by Hon. John Eaton, LL.D. 8. The Imagination; A. P. Markle, Ph.D. 9. The University—How and What; by W. W. Folwell, LL.D. Editorial—10. LeRoy Brown, Ph.D. 11. Report of U. S. Commissioner of Education for 1884.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, February, 1884. (New York.)—1. Corporations, their Employés, and the Public; by Carl Schurz. 2. Henry Vaughan, Silurist; by Principal J. C. Shairp. 3. John Brown's Place in History; by Senator J. J. Ingalls. 4. Must the Classics Go? by Prof. Andrew F. West. 5. Race Progress in the United States; by J. R. Tucker, M.C. 6. Defects of the Public School System; by Rev. M. J. Savage. 7. Rival Systems of Heating; by Dr. A. N. Bell and Prof. W. P. Trowbridge.

March, 1884.—1. Is our Civilization Perishable; by Judge J. A. Jameson. 2. Agricultural Politics in England; by William E. Bear. 3. A Defenseless Seaboard; by Gen. H. A. Smalley. 4. Neither Genius nor Martyr; by Alice Hyneman Rhine. 5. The Story of a Nomination; by W. O. Stoddard. 6. Literary Resurrectionists; by Charles T. Congden. 7. How to Improve the Mississippi; by Robert S. Taylor. 8. The Constitutionality of Repudiation; by D. H. Chamberlain and John S. Wise, M.C.

PRINCETON REVIEW, January, 1884. (New York.)—1. Agnosticism in American Fiction; by Julian Hawthorne. 2. On the Education of Statesmen; by Prof. Henry C. Adams. 3. The Railway Problem. 4. A Study of the Mind's Chambers of Imagery; by President M'Cosh and Professor Henry F. Osborn. 5. The Morrow of the Gladstone Administration; by Canon George Rawlinson. 6. The College of To-day.

March, 1884.—1. The Study of Greek; by George P. Foster, D.D., LL.D. 2. Our Colleges Before the Country; by Prof. Wm. G. Sumner. 3. The Tariff on Works of Art; by Henry Marquand. 4. The Modern German Novel; by Hjalmar H. Boyesen. 5. Some Aspects of the Divorce Question; by Samuel W. Dike. 6. Our Experience in Taxing Distilled Spirits; by Hon. David A. Wells.

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, January, 1884. (New York.)—1. The Sacraments and the Children of the Church; by Rev. H. J. VanDyke, D.D. 2. Degeneration of Romanism Since the Reformation; by Prof. Thos. Croskery, D.D. 3. Healing Through Faith; by Rev. R. L. Stanton, D.D. 4. The Mediæval Communists; by Rev. Maurice G. Hansen. 5. A New Principle in Education. 6. Notes and Notices. 7. Reviews of Recent Theological Literature.

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH, January, 1884. (Macon, Georgia.)—1. Greek Mythology and Philosophy; by Professor J. C. C. Newton, A.M. 2. The Soul; by President G. T. Gould, D.D. 3. Suicide—Causes and Cure; by Rev. H. M. DuBose. 4. Methodist Church Membership; by D. C. Kelley, D.D. 5. Locke on Government; by Dwight M. Lowrey, Esq. 6. Hayne's Poems; by Rev. George Williams Walker. 7. Atonement—Its Conservative Force; by Rev. W. Jackson. 8. Two Women; by Isabel D. Martin. 9. Human Freedom—Divine Necessity; by Rev. W. I. Gill, A.M. 10. Mary of Bethany; by A. A. L.

NEW ENGLANDER, March, 1884. (New Haven.)—1. Scientific Ethics; by Hon. H. T. Steele. 2. Darwinism and Christianity; from the German of Wm. Bender; by E. G. Bourne. 3. Woman's Suffrage; by Prof. Goodwin. 4. Teleology, Old and New; by F. A. Mansfield. 5. The Extradition of Criminals; by F. M. Stone. 6. Moral Defects in Recent Sunday-school Teaching; by Rev. J. M. Whiton. 7. The Substitutes for Christianity Proposed by Comte and Spencer; by Julia H. Gulliver. 8. Personal Characteristics of Luther; by C. W. Ernst. 9. Catharine Adorna; by Rev. B. Hart. 10. Notices of New Books.

The Rev. Burdett Hart, after an appreciative analysis of the experience of Catharine Adorna, remarks:

If we are not mistaken, it is a very common opinion among Christians that it is *necessary* to sin while they remain in this world. They would not put that statement boldly into their creeds; they would not assert it in their exhortations to young disciples; they would not dare to state it in form in their prayers to God. But their confessions of daily sin have that undertone in them, and their daily lives are graded down to that standard. They are not surprised at themselves when they see that they have need of the confession of sin; they would be surprised if they had no such need. They do not regard it simply as a certain truth that they will sin, but as a necessary truth that they must be expected to sin. They regard sin, especially in regard to Christians, more as a misfortune than a crime. Because they have been sinners, they look upon it as a kind of unavoidable doom that they must be so still. It belongs to their imperfection. . . . With such views there cannot be that struggle against sin which is the duty of the believer, nor that freedom from sin which should

be the aim of a holy life. There must be the hope of success to encourage effort, and the accepted promise of success also.

The book before us presents a different view. "Her business, as she understood it," says the narrator of Madame Adorna, "was not to transgress against God, but to believe in him and love him, and to fulfill, with divine assistance, all his holy purposes."

So far all can go. So far Christians ought to believe. That standard is a practical and a practicable one. To go beyond this, and to claim that we are free from sin, actually and entirely, to claim that they have attained and are already perfect, *must be within the domain of radical error.*

If this last sentence be true, why are those Christians to be censured who think, as stated above in the first paragraph, "that it is necessary to sin while they remain in this world." And how can it be made to harmonize with the sentence that next precedes it, which claims that Christians "ought to believe" with Madame Adorna, that it is not their business to "transgress against God, but to believe in him and love him, and to fulfill, with divine assistance, all his holy purposes?" Is not one who possesses faith and love, and fulfills all God's purposes, "free from sin?" Surely this writer unwittingly involves himself in palpable contradictions. And this, evidently, not from any lack of sympathy with the conception of a sinless life, but because he fails to make the Wesleyan distinction between absolute and Christian perfection. The latter is not properly claimed to be ideal, angelic, or legal perfection; but it is the complete sovereignty of divine love over the affections, and such an outworking of that love in holy actions as makes its possessor, in the words of St. James, "perfect and entire, wanting nothing." Was James living "within the domain of radical error?"

CATHOLIC WORLD, January, 1884. (New York.)—1. The Protestant Episcopal Convention. 2. The First Christmas Eve. 3. Psyche, or the Romance of Nature. 4. Reminiscences of Bethlehem; by M. P. Thompson. 5. The Coiner's Den; by C. U. O'Keeffe. 6. Wicked No. 7; by Wm. Seton. 7. A Story of Nuremberg; by Agnes Repplier. 8. The Turk in Ireland; by W. P. Dennehy. 9. Armine, Chapters 31–33; by Christian Reid. 10. New Publications.

February.—1. The Supposed Issue between Religion and Science; by Rev. G. M. Searle. 2. The True Beatrice Cenci. 3. Some Aspects of the Negro Problem; by Rev. J. R. Slattery. 4. The Youth of Pedro de Ribadeneyra; by J. M. Stone. 5. A Haunt of Painters; by E. G. Martin. 6. Uncle George's Experiments; by M. M. Meline. 7. What Shall our Young Men Do? by Rev. A. F. Hewitt. 8. An Answer to Neal Dow; by Rev. C. A. Walworth. 9. Armine, Chapters 34–36; by C. Reid. 10. New Publications.

Mr. Walworth utters some strong words against the worst class of liquor sellers, against drunkenness, and, alas! also against

the constitutional prohibition of the liquor traffic. He "cannot believe that a wide-spread intemperance is inseparable from the sale of alcoholic drinks." He is evidently sincere in this unbelief, but if he will read the lesson of modern history he will learn that the liquor traffic and wide-spread intemperance have been generally, if not always, related as cause and effect. They are like the Siamese twins, in that the death of one involves the destruction of both.

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, January, 1884. (London.)—1. Martin Luther, the Hero of the Reformation; by Rev. C. H. H. Wright. 2. A Glimpse of the Waldensian Valleys; by Rev. Hugh Macmillan. 3. The New Theology; by Rev. R. M. M'Cheyne Edgar, M.A. 4. The Christian Attitude. 5. The Visions of Zechariah; by Rev. Wm. Burnet. 6. Modern Biblical Criticism: Its History and Methods; by Prof. Howard Osgood, D.D. 7. The Metaphysical and Theological Applications of Induction and Analogy; by Prof. R. L. Dabney, D.D., LL.D. 8. The Philosophical Basis of Theism; by B. G. Stevens. 9. Current Literature.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1884. (London.)—1. Mr. Gladstone. 2. The Inspiration of Death in Folk-Poetry. 3. Palestine West of the Jordan. 4. Lay and Medical Functions in Hospital Administration. 5. Ulster and Home Rule. 6. Recent Theories of the Pentateuch. 7. Political Survey of the Quarter. 8. Contemporary Literature.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, October, 1883. (London and New York.)—1. Prowe's Life of Copernicus. 2. Early Law and Custom. 3. Letters and Memorials of Cardinal Allen. 4. Russian Railways in Asia. 5. The Scottish Language. 6. The Hartfordshire Pomona. 7. Schubert—Chopin—Liszt. 8. Vicksburg and Gettysburg; by the Comte de Paris. 9. The Correspondence of Lord Aberdeen.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, October, 1883. (London and New York.)—1. Great Britain and the United States on the Irish Question. 2. Henry Greville and Lord Ronald Gower. 3. Gold Fields: Ancient and Modern. 4. The Belief in the Immortality of the Soul. 5. Australian Federation. 6. Ernest Renan. 7. Politico-Economical Heterodoxy; Cliffe Leslie. 8. Dr. Tuke's History of the Insane in the British Islands. 9. Contemporary Literature. India and Our Colonial Empire.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, OR CRITICAL JOURNAL, January, 1884. (London and New York.)—1. Government of the Indian Empire. 2. The Spencerian Philosophy. 3. The Anarchy of Paris. 4. Edersheim's Life and Times of the Messiah. 5. The Egyptian Question. 6. The Literary Life of Anthony Trollope. 7. Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction. 8. An Embassy to Rome. 9. Parliamentary Reform.

Of lives of the Christ there seems to be no end. Happily, both the theme and the demand are inexhaustible; and although that Life has been so much discussed, and in so many lights, there yet remains, and always will remain, something to be

said which has not been said before. Of the "Life and Times of the Messiah," by Dr. Edersheim, the Review named above claims that it is of "an unusual character, both as to its contents and the peculiar qualification of the author." It contains, says its writer, "an amount of archæological information, of facts illustrating Jewish thought and feeling, of acute analysis of character, and of graphic delineation of civil and religious life at the beginning of the Christian era which renders this a unique work." We give the following passage from Edersheim, and the remarks with which the reviewer introduces it:

Much of the opposition to Jesus in the gospels is inexplicable on modern principles. The miracles, which are an obstacle to belief in a skeptical and scientific age, as Dr. Edersheim justly observes, were precisely what was expected in the times of the Messiah. The Jews are not represented as denying that Jesus did many wonderful works, yet they reject his divine mission. In the present day, the concession of miraculous powers to Christ is instantly followed by professed obedience to his claims as a teacher, but the Jewish rulers admit the miracles and then crucify the Christ. From our stand-point this is inconsistent, but not from theirs. Dr. Edersheim thus explains their conduct:

"It was enmity to the *person* and *teaching* of Jesus which led to the denial of his claims. The inquiry, By what power Jesus did these works? they met by the assertion that it was through that of Satan, or the chief of the demons. They regarded Jesus as not only temporarily but permanently possessed by a demon, or as the constant vehicle of satanic influence. And this demon was, according to them, none other than Beelzebub, the prince of the devils. Thus in their view it was really Satan who acted in and through him; and Jesus, instead of being recognized as the Son of God, was regarded as an incarnation of Satan; instead of being owned as the Messiah, was denounced and treated as the representative of the Kingdom of Darkness. All this because the kingdom which he came to open, and which he preached, was precisely the opposite of what they regarded as the Kingdom of God. Thus it was the essential contrariety of Rabbinism to the Gospel of Christ that lay at the foundation of their conduct toward the Person of Christ. We venture to assert that this accounts for the whole history up to the cross."

In the closing paragraph of his paper this reviewer says:

No one can read this book without receiving fresh light upon this story which no repetition can render stale. Nor can it be perused without confessing that of all the tragedies this world has witnessed not one has been so sad and so moving as the passion of the Man of Sorrows.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, October, 1883. (New York.)—1. Rev. Edward Hawkins, D.D., Provost of Oriel College, Oxford. 2. Socialism in England. 3. Saint Teresa. 4. The Fur Seals of Commerce. 5. Marshal Bugeaud, Duke of Italy. 6. Trade Routes to China, and French Occupation of Tonquin. 7. Ecclesiastical Courts Commission. 8. Disintegration.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1884. (London.)—1. National Education at Home and Abroad. 2. The Uncertainties of Science. 3. The Antiquity of Civilization. 4. The First Principles of Early Methodism. 5. Luther and his Critics. 6. Spain. 7. The Church Congress. 8. The Pauline Doctrine of Union with Christ. Short Reviews and Brief Notices.

The Review is fully abreast with the times. In its second and third articles it meets the skeptical scientists of the day on their own ground, applies to their alleged facts and to their philosophy tests similar to those by which they test revelation. And it must needs be confessed that they do not escape unshorn. They are, in fact, "hoist with their own petard." Placed on the defensive, they appear far less formidable than when, with great flourish of trumpets, they rush to assault the truth. We greatly misjudge the spirit of society if it be not already passing out of that mist of scientific doubt which for a few years past has threatened to establish itself and to unsettle public faith in Holy Scripture.

German Reviews.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN, (Theological Essays and Reviews.) 1884. Second Number.—*Essays:* 1. HERING, The Beneficence of the German Reformation, (second paper.) 2. Orations delivered at the Universities of Halle and Wittenberg on the occasion of the fourth centenary of Luther's birthday, one oration by Prof. J. KÖSTLIN, and one by the Rector, Prof. BORETIUS. 3. RIEHM, Luther as a Bible Translator. *Thoughts and Remarks.* HOFSTEDE DE GROOT, Luther in his Study. *Reviews:* KÖSTLIN: Views of new additions to the life of Luther in the year 1883. *Miscellanies:* 1. Programme of the Teyler Theological Society of Harlem for the year 1884. 2. Programme of the Society of the Hague for the defense of the Christian Religion.

From the above table of contents it will be seen that this number of the above periodical is almost entirely confined to Luther. The shadow of the great reformer seems to hover over the German theological mind of late, to the exclusion of every other subject. Of the above articles we opine that the one of most interest to general readers will be that of Prof. Riehm on "Luther as a Bible Translator." Among the blessings which God bestowed on the German nation through Martin Luther one may well claim the German Bible as the greatest

and the noblest. With good reason one may ask: "If among the blessings of the Reformation this one failed, what would have become of the others?" In the jubilee year, therefore, it is befitting to pay marked attention to this perennial treasure that the nation possesses in its Luther Bible. Even that learned Catholic scholar, Dr. Döllinger, recently declared that this work alone made him the greatest benefactor of his nation, and that all Catholics should forget all else than this, and for it join in the national celebration. Luther himself laid no claim to the entire work which he commenced on the Wartburg. He was ready and willing to call to his aid those loyal companions who sat by his side and counseled with him in all his difficult labors. He said repeatedly, "It is a great work, and worthy of our best powers, because it is for the common good." And again he said, "I will not touch the Old Testament unless you, my friends, assist me. If we all work together we shall have enough to do in the Bible, the one with his learning and the other with his understanding."

Melanchthon was his great helper. Before he put the translation of the New Testament, which he had performed on the Wartburg, in the hands of the printers, he called to his aid several of his friends for a thorough revision. But he was so impatient to bring it out that he was hardly willing to allow himself and his colleagues the necessary time for the work. At a later period he and Melanchthon revised this on the basis of the Greek and Latin texts. But, thankful as Luther was for the assistance of his friends, and to whom he had done full justice before the world, he had a good claim to say of his translation: "It is my Testament and my translation, and shall remain mine." The creative work belonged entirely to him; that of his collaborators consisted only in suggesting, completing, or improving. His colleagues always regarded him as the translator called of God, and as the only one sufficient for the great work.

One must make an effort to realize the great task that he had undertaken in order rightly to judge and appreciate his immortal masterpiece. And he who knows the ruling conceptions of his period in regard to the art of translating can alone admire him as the fortunate pathfinder in this new and unexplored field. There was a species of German Bible, before

that of Luther, by a monk of Halle, of which several small editions were printed. But it was a translation from the Vulgate, and in which no allowance was made for the peculiarities of the Latin or the German tongue; there was a slavish imitation of the Latin text which was often totally misunderstood. Luther used not the Vulgate as a basis, but rather the original text, following each expression as nearly as possible up to its original source. But it required a great deal of courage in him to free himself fully from the chains of ecclesiastical authority, and as translator to follow the current of his intentions against the numerous and violent accusations of his opponents that he was abandoning the old and accepted text of the Christian Church.

And added to these troubles there were whole mountains of difficulties to be overcome from the state of linguistic science at that period and the narrowness and imperfection of the means at his command. He repeatedly declared, in reference to Job and the prophets, that he labored and worried in conjunction with his assistants until the work became at times so discouraging that he almost came to the conviction that he had undertaken too much, especially in the matter of the Old Testament. But under all discouragements and trials he still labored on, and called to his aid all outside means that could in any way afford him light and aid. In many technical matters he did not hesitate to call even unlettered men into his confidence and counsel. He would consult the anatomist and the butcher in regard to the slaughter of animals and their preparation for the sacrifice, to make sure that he would give no imperfect idea of the subject which he was describing. And thus he at last prepared a book that has been a source of national as well as religious culture, and one which lies nearest to the heart of the German people. It is with them, indeed, the Book of books, and more read than any other. It is the inestimable national treasure, and the broad basis of the religious development of all German Protestantism.

French Reviews.

REVUE CHRETIENNE, (Christian Review.) November, 1883.—1. FALLOA, Laical Religion. 2. SECRÉTAN, The Philosophy of George Sand. 3. BERSIER, The Religious Crisis of Coligny. 4. WAGNER. Luther. Monthly Review by PRESSENSÉ.

December, 1883.—ASTIÉ, The Fear of the Protestant Principle in the Ranks of French Protestantism. 2. SABATIER, Madame de Remusat and Her Son. 3. ***, The Conscience of the Heart. 4. Correspondence by BOUVIER. Literary Notices. Monthly Review.

January, 1884.—1. STAPIER, The Question of Biblical Versions. 2. DARTIGUE, Contemporary Catholic Preaching. 3. BRIDEL, Philosophical Chronicle. 5. The Old Messenger of the Vosges, by L. R. Bibliographical Notice by HOLLARD. Review of the Month by E. DE PRESSENSE.

Revue Chretienne opens its volume for 1884 under very encouraging prospects. It is understood to be the most popular and acceptable representative of French Protestantism, and is so because of the breadth of its views and the latitude of its aims. It is necessarily popular in its character, because it must respond to the needs of many who have scarcely any other literary resource under the lead of the Protestant Church, and it must necessarily be broad to enlist the sympathy of Churches that are quite different in their individual character, while supporting a common cause and having one Christian aim. We have simply to look over a table of contents of the last year to perceive in the work of its contributors acceptable articles in the various literary, philosophical, and religious domains, on subjects most worthy of occupying the attention of French Protestantism. For the coming year the editor promises new and more energetic efforts to reach the height of their mission, in both the Christian and liberal spirit to which they invariably remain true. The amount of matter offered to the editorial corps is so great that they much desire an increase in the capacity of the *Revue*. This shows an energy and activity in the ranks of the French Protestants that augurs well for the future.

The *facilis princeps* of the *Revue* will continue to be the energetic and aggressive Edmond de Pressensé, notwithstanding the fact that he has recently been elevated to the rank of senatorial dignity. In the bulletin for the coming year, he calms the fears of his friends by assuring them that his new duties will not prevent him from performing the same labor for this periodical in the future that he has devoted to it in the

past. This will be welcome information to some who are not aware that Pressensé has the working power and energy of two ordinary men.

In the closing number of the last volume of the *Revue* he expresses his gratitude for the marks of sympathy received from all shades of French Protestantism and of the Liberal party, on the occasion of his election to the Senate. He acknowledges this to be a powerful encouragement to the performance of his duty in the severe conflicts of the near future. And he foreshadows the energy and boldness of his purpose in his new capacity by giving his friends very clearly to understand that in his senatorial position he will meet and oppose the recent action of the Chamber of Deputies in its vote on the Budget for Public Worship. He unhesitatingly declares that the reduction of the appropriation for this purpose indicates the real character of the policy of the majority in the question of the relations between Church and State, already sufficiently indicated by the passage of a municipal law of the same character, by the City Council of Paris. He declares these to be like attempts to impoverish and enfeeble the Church, in order to reach a separation of the two powers, when this *régime* has become impossible to the cause of religion, and this in the name of free thought, flaunted as a political flag. He condemns these resolutions from every point of view, and promises to meet them in this spirit when they shall be brought before the Senate; and we have no doubt but that this promise will be kept, and that the great champion of French Protestantism will be a fearless combatant on the senatorial arena.

The leading article in the December number by Astié, on "The Fear of the Protestant Principle in the Ranks of French Protestantism," is extremely suggestive of the fears and doubts that trouble the heart of the Church. For many years before the great National Synod, held by the permission and under the *régime* of Thiers, the French Churches were so essentially divided and estranged from each other that it was no easy matter to decide on the essential principle of Protestantism. After they came together in apparent unity, they learned that there was a great divergence in their views in regard to the major principle that bound them together. For some years, therefore, the leading thinkers of the Church have been

discussing this question in books, reviews, and sermons. It finally reached the platforms of their pastoral conferences, and in this field our author appears, with the reply to a question, presented by the Central Committee of a Pastoral Association of Switzerland. This question was as follows: "What is the principle of Protestantism?" And Astié replies to it in substance as follows:

"The three questions which we must examine from an historical point of view, in order to remain faithful to the programme of your Central Committee, will be these: What have we been? What have we become? and, What is the future in reserve for us? And we thus reply: 'What is the primitive idea of Protestantism, that from which all others have sprung, and which brings them all back to unity by imprinting on them its seal?' We call attention to the fact that the question concerns the primitive idea of *Protestantism*, and not that of the *Reformation*, which began by a fact, and not by an idea. Neither is it a question of the principle of Protestant theology, which did not appear until a later period.

"This elimination conducts us to the Diet of Spires in 1529, when our fathers accidentally received a name which has been accepted with more or less good grace by all the Churches that have sprung from the movement of the sixteenth century. Frightened by the incessant progress of the reformatory work, said Diet decided that they would accept the accomplished facts, but that in the future it would no longer be permitted to attempt new conquests. It was against this assumption of settling the religious question by a majority of votes that our fathers protested. 'We cannot,' they said, 'act otherwise than according to the demands of our own conscience.' But what is it that gives to conscience the courage and the strength to protest? It is because it has imbibed the conviction of its rights, or rather of its duties. The minority declared that, in all matters that concerned the salvation of our soul and eternal happiness, each one is responsible before God alone, and that it is to him only that we must render an accounnt for our convictions.

"In this way the *subjective* character of Protestantism above all else is established in an historical manner. But what is the nature of this subjectivism? The object of the protest clearly

indicates the reply. Our fathers protested when the Diet wished to rob them of the right of pursuing the conquests of the Reformation of which they were already the children, and of which, in case of need, they were ready to be the martyrs. Now, why and how was the Reformation effected? The most bitter enemies which it provoked could tell us in case of need. They wished above all things to bring back their protesting colleagues to the confessional, and to the tribunal of penitence. It is on the indispensable intermediary of the sacrament, of which the hierarchy possesses the exclusive administration, that it bases its power to hold the conscience captive. What rendered the Reformation possible, and that which served it as a lever, was the intense conviction in both Luther and Zwingle of the absolute importance of Jesus; in clinging directly to him as the only source of salvation they emancipated the human conscience from the yoke of the Church, and in spite of themselves.

"I have said *in spite of themselves*, and this reservation is decisive. In the beginning our fathers intended, as faithful sons, to be the reformers of the existing Church; nothing was farther from their intentions than the project of founding *new* Churches. All the ideas which they advanced they presented as having the right of citizenship in the dominant Church, of which they themselves formed a part, and which had taught them these same ideas. The subjectivism of the reformers was, therefore, not exclusive—it was eminently social, both as to its bases and as to its aspirations. And this brings us to that which constitutes both the strong and the weak point of the work of the sixteenth century. It was in yielding to this social element that our fathers were reformers and not simply the representatives of a contemplative and quietistic tendency, seeing that God himself, and the circumstances of the period, were assuming the task of reforming the Church. But our fathers clung too much to the idea of remaining ecclesiastical reformers, and this was their weak point.

"It is true that religious and moral interest rules every thing; when it was a question of sacrificing the rights of conscience to enter into direct communion with Jesus Christ, they prefer to break with the Church, but they do it in spite of themselves, in self-defense, and as little as possible. It is for this reason

that their work remained incomplete, and that in many regards it failed. We are therefore in harmony with those who find their origin in the one single principle of Protestantism. The ancient distinction between the formal principle and the real principle appears to us singularly apocryphal. At a later period, undoubtedly, our fathers were greatly desirous of being in accord with the Scriptures; but in the beginning they first appealed to ecclesiastical law, to tradition, and to the general council as the only legitimate and definitive authority. They began to insist on the authority of the Scriptures only in the course of the conflict, and not until they saw themselves obliged to renounce the hope of reforming the Church; for then they needed to invoke an authority in order to justify their doctrines and the claims of God, in opposition to a majority which repudiated them, and with whom they had differed for other reasons. Having been forced into a minority by the majority of the ruling Church, they were compelled to prove that they possessed an authority superior to that which condemned them."

This significant discussion we consider a very healthy one for the period, and believe that the French Church need not fear to raise such a standard as their principle of Protestantism, namely, direct appeal to scriptural authority.

Art. X.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE FREE CHURCH OF FRANCE.

The Free Church of France seems to be holding its position very fairly against many counteracting influences. At its late synod there were reported thirty-four congregations with 4,500 members, and besides this about twenty mission stations, of which some are on the point of rising into the dignity of independent congregations. This comparatively weak body has in about two years collected 335,000 francs for its ecclesiastical wants, while giving considerable to works of private benevolence. At its recent synod some very vigorous thoughts were expressed by distinguished speakers, indicating an ardent desire for a sound, manly, and popular religion. This key-note of the assembly has since been brought out in bold relief by the *Journal du Protestantisme Français*, which says: "We have never ceased to defend these views, since we claim for our Protestantism the right to develop itself in harmony with the highest endeavors of the spirit of our age." Pressensé, as usual, was the controlling figure of the occasion, in a splendid address

on the debt which French Protestantism owes to Russia. In another address, by Pastor Pezzi, on the history of the principles of the Free Church since 1848, he laid down the following three as the cardinal ones, namely, confession of the name of Christ, individual confession of faith, and the autonomy of the Church. A point worthy of notice was the fact that a prominent member of the body declared himself opposed to bequeathals for the Church, because the self-sacrifice of the individual members might thereby be rendered torpid. Another member would receive them only under the condition of immediate wants for the uses of the Church, but not for capitalization. Several important resolutions were adopted, first, that the name should be changed from *Union des Eglises Evangeliques de France* to *Eglises Evangeliques libres.* A new article was added to the fourth chapter of the constitution, as follows: "Baptism and the Holy Communion shall be administered as institutions;" but without fixing, in regard to baptism, the manner and the period of its application. Another question of general interest was concerning the consecration of the evangelists. There was a difference of opinion in regard to the amount of New Testament Greek to be demanded in their examinations. The synod finally resolved that if the candidates were found competent in other respects to admit them to consecration without any knowledge of the Greek. But it was distinctly declared that the full consecration for pastoral work should not be granted without a knowledge of the Greek. We are pleased to see that the independent position of these *Eglises libres* is being more and more acknowledged by other Protestant bodies of Europe, and it was proved, by the fraternal deputations from other ecclesiastical organizations that were received and greeted, that the Free Church of France is a nucleus for liberal and untrammeled theology, that may grow from the mustard-seed to become a great tree in French Protestantism. The main difference between this Church and that of the National Reformed Church of France is the fact that the former is independent and the latter dependent. The spirit of the age is the triumph of independence in the Church as in the State.

A CATHOLIC CONGRESS IN ITALY.

The Catholics of Italy are following the example of their Protestant opponents in holding congresses for the discussion of the leading questions that interest them in the great ecclesiastical conflicts. Shortly after the Pope gave audience to the small army of clericals and laymen who sought his presence in the Vatican and St. Peter's, an Italian Catholic Congress was held in Naples. According to the report presented to this body, the members of the association number about 60,000, divided into provincial, diocesan, and parochial associations, showing a very systematic organization and combination of these clerical and lay forces in the Italian realm. That the convocation was a brilliant and significant one may be inferred from the fact that there were present about thirty bishops and archbishops, together with numerous distinguished

representatives of the Italian nobility and members of municipal authorities, which latter, in the great centers of Italy, are beginning more and more to assume the clerical character.

The Prince of Bisignano was made president of the meeting, and in his opening address called earnest attention to the necessity of standing closely around the successor of St. Peter in his trials and tribulations. He presented, as a principal means of opposing atheism and Protestant propaganda in the schools, the most careful culture of Catholic education for youth. And on the same subject there were two other earnest reports, by 'Canon' Mineo and Prince Macchia, of Naples. The latter called attention to the fact of the necessity for the immediate establishment of Catholic schools in Naples, and the preservation of religious instruction in the municipal schools now in operation. The Bishop of Foggia recommended the foundation of a great theological faculty in Naples, which he declared would be the crystallizing center for a complete Catholic university, with all the departments. We surmise that no small share of this anxiety in regard to Naples is the recently developed activity of our own Methodist mission work in that city, which is felt by the authorities of the Church to be the beginning of great danger for their Catholic parochial schools. Another important question was a comprehensive plan of organization for the Catholics of Italy who were truly loyal to the Holy See. The army of papal supporters, for elections in Catholic interests, for protests against godless laws, and for sacrifice for the purposes of the Church, must in every parish have a central direction for its organization, in order to be ready, at a given watch-word, to enter into concerted action. Even the pilgrimages are to be controlled by a regular organization; and each pilgrim is to be provided with a "Pilgrim's Manual." A long and patient discussion was devoted to the social questions of the day, namely, the establishment of kitchens for the people, the Christianizing of the family, and the condition of the working classes. In these matters the Neapolitan nobility was entreated to be especially active. It was even resolved to cultivate a taste for historical investigation of the Church according to the method of the Pope. All this clearly proves the increasing and dangerous activity of the Papal Church of Italy.

THE LUTHER FESTIVALS IN ITALY.

The Luther festivals that have been so surprisingly numerous and enthusiastic in Italy have doubtless pierced the Vatican between the joints of its armor, and irritated it to unusual activity. The papal power has considered it a special challenge that the poisonous rebel of the sixteenth century, the doctor and master of a great portion of Germany, should thus rise from his tomb to renew his persecutions of the Church. The climax was added to this when it was one morning announced that in the palace of the German embassy there would be a religious ceremony in honor of the great reformer. The *Popolo Romano* also announced that, besides the embassy and its *personnel*, there would also be present

the nephew of the emperor. This fact alone was necessary to signalize the character of the ceremony. A Luther festival in the chapel of the German embassy, with the presence of one of the German princes, was quite enough to give a most defined character to the occasion. The Vatican press spoke lightly of the affair, forgetting that this religious celebration of the occasion was by order of the emperor. Even the special German embassador exhibited so little diplomatic tact as to appear on that occasion, with the Prussian and Baden princes, and a hundred other German Protestant dignitaries. This official leading off of the Luther festivals in the land of the Pope and capital of the papacy was a significant hint to the German Protestants of all Italy, who were profited and strengthened by the example. In Naples, Rome, Florence, and Palermo the celebrations were very brilliant. Every-where the churches could scarcely contain the masses that crowded to the ceremony, and every-where the orators seemed inspired to strike the effective key-note without indulging in useless polemics. In Florence the festival was international, and the addresses were delivered by a German, an Italian, an Englishman, and a Frenchman. Even in the famous Protestant military chapel of Capellini were found a large number of Italian soldiers listening to the story of the conflicts of the great German reformer with the Pope. After the regular services of the occasion were ended several of the subordinate officers among the Italians absolutely delivered addresses and led in prayer; and the services were concluded by the enthusiastic singing of the great battle-hymn of Luther in Italian. It is scarcely possible to comprehend the significance of such an event in the city of the Pontiff, or to grasp by the imagination the extent and the influence of these exercises themselves throughout the Italian peninsula.

PROTESTANT WORK IN AUSTRIA.

The Protestants of Austria have had a fearful struggle to obtain and maintain the rights granted to them a few years ago in that country, largely at the instance of the Evangelical Alliance. But they were recently allowed to hold in Vienna a general synod of both branches of their Church. The emperor kindly received a deputation of the synod, and in return for the assurance of loyalty to the state were, for their part, assured by the monarch that the Protestant Church might rely in the future on the protection and support of the authorities. Those of the Augsburg Confession counted forty-three members, and of the Helvetian Confession twenty-one members. The curious and troublesome question of nationality and the language to be used in the transaction of business was the first to present itself, and it was resolved that the principal record of the proceedings should be made in the Bohemian tongue. Unfortunate as this may seem, it was just; because in Bohemia and Moravia the Protestant congregations number 120,000 souls, while the German congregations in the provinces of Vienna and Galicia count but 8,000. The Germans do not understand Bohemian, while

nearly all the members from Bohemia and Moravia understand and speak the German. It is a great pity that the Protestants of Austria thus introduce into their convocation the same apple of discord that is now dividing the politicians. If these synods hereafter shall insist on the use of the language that a large number of the leading members of the body cannot understand, the result will be a division of the forces.

The proceedings were of a very broad and general character, referring to the Protestant theological faculty of the University of Vienna, to the elementary schools for their children, and the marriage laws. They desire that the connection of their faculty with the State University shall be genuine, and not apparent. The Academic Senate is opposed to this, but the synod demands it as a logical sequence of the privileges granted to their body. In the matter of the schools they make two complaints, one is in regard to the legal position of Protestant schools, and the other as to the use of Catholic prayers in the public schools. As to the Protestant schools, it was resolved to appeal to majesty for a revision of the late school law, which declares Protestant elementary schools to be private institutions, and thus dispossesses them of general rights under the school law. The revision desired would give to the Protestant schools the character of public schools, and enable them to collect the school funds from their adherents. It is much to be hoped that this appeal to the monarch may have a fortunate result, and it now seems that such a hope will be likely to be realized. The deputation of the synod appointed to present the petition has been kindly received by the emperor, and it is hardly possible now that he could do otherwise than throw the weight of his influence in favor of relief and protection to the Protestant schools. A far more troublesome question for the Protestants of Austria is that of the laws concerning marriage that are extremely narrow and tyrannical, and there is but little probability that the resolutions of the synod will effect much in this regard. It is now impossible for Catholic priests who leave their orders and become Protestants to marry; and mixed marriages, where permitted, are indissoluble, and in nearly all cases are permitted only on the condition that the children issuing from such marriages shall be inscribed on the public records and educated as Catholics. The entire question of mixed marriages in Austria is the most sensitive one in the social organization, and is bound to cause much trouble in the future. The late Austrian cardinal was opposed to any modification of these laws, as also to the admission of a Protestant faculty into the university, and his influence still remains after him.

ART. XI.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

THE theological periodicals and reviews of Germany are absolutely filled with all sorts of matter concerning Luther, his labors, his contemporaries, and the thousands of festivals of every shade that have taken place, in the Fatherland and elsewhere, in honor of his deeds and memory. Therefore, to reflect the theological spirit of the hour, we are forced to follow suit. The rarest literary innovation in this line is a drama, entitled "Historical Exposition of Luther, in Seven Parts." This so-called drama was absolutely played by the students of Jena on the dramatic boards of that little city; and it is said to have produced the most profound impression by the poetic power with which the principal episodes of the life of the reformer were presented, by a sober but attractive *mise en scène*, and the vivacious dialogue, enlivened by unique and original expressions. It was, in short, a history of the Reformation dramatized and performed like the ancient mystery plays of the Middle Ages, with a language completely modern, and with the sentiments of our own era. Except the characters of Luther and Katerina von Bora, confided to actors of the highest merit, the drama was played, and very well played, it is said, by students and citizens of Jena. At Worms they were even still bolder. A dramatic work of Professor Hering, declared to be equal to that of Devrient himself, was performed by the very faithful in person, in the very church of the Trinity. The role of Luther was performed by Dr. Bassermann, of Stuttgart. The grand scene of the Diet of Worms, where the immortal reformer, surrounded by all the princes of Germany, cast into the face of Charles the Fifth his undying expression, "I cannot do otherwise, so help me God," produced an immense effect. This strange event is the theater reconciled with the Church, at least for a day—the theater returning to its original use in the Middle Ages—returning to the Church, which was, in fact, its mother.

From the German press there still continues to flow a steady stream of Luther literature of the highest order. The association for the preservation of the literature of the Reformation has opened its column with Professor Kolde's "Luther and the Diet of Worms." Friedrich Soldan treats the same subject, with special reference to the surrounding localities of Worms. Dr. Lorenz, in collaboration with the corps of German professors and pastors, has published a calendar of the Luther festival, in which the various relations of Ehrfurt to the humanistic aims of the period of Luther, to the Reformation, to Gustavus Adolphus, and to the Catholicism of the period, are exhaustingly treated. General Superintendent Erdmann, in Berlin, presents us with an extremely rich and learned monograph on "Luther and the Hohenzollerns." In this work each separate investigation in regard to Luther's relations to this influential ruling house enriches our knowledge and discloses the

far-seeing political eye of the reformer, as well as his delicate and well-digested tact.

The parent Bible Society of Prussia has published Kleinert's treatise on Luther's prefaces to the Sacred Scriptures. Pastor Ninck, in Hamburg, gives a very judicious extract from the favorite monograph of Luther, "Of the Liberty of a Christian Man," under the peculiar title, "Free from Every Body and Yet the Servant of All." With a skillful hand Musical Director Stein, in Wittenberg, treats of Luther's "Musical Significance and Activity." The same author has composed several popular chorals for the liturgical festival on the jubilee day. In addition to these, the same Bible Society has published a goodly number of liturgical devotions for the use of the churches during the festival days.

Luther's hymns have also been the object of the greatest attention. During his life-time he received the *sobriquet* of the nightingale of Wittenberg, and his undying notes have ever resounded, even through years of darkness, down to the present light of day. One of the works is entitled "The Nightingale of Wittenberg," and introduces his hymns with most instructive notices. The Christian songs of the German Churches would be a comparative blank without the hymns of Luther, for on these has been based all the hymnology of the German Protestant Churches since that day. Some of these publications are accompanied with Luther's proverbs, adages, and fables, because of their peculiarly poetic character, and the fact that many of his hymns were based on these. In connection with these we may mention some of the artistic productions of the Reformation, now revived and republished, especially the large ones of Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, Frederick the Wise, and Hutten. A very excellent engraving of Luther, at the ridiculously low figure of three cents apiece, and in quantities at even a lower rate, has been published by tens of thousands, and, in spite of its low price, is really an acceptable ornament for the modest households of the masses.

The relations between Wiclif and Huss are being brought out into a clearer light under the inspiration of the large attention being paid to the history of the Reformation. That there were close connections between the Bohemian movement of the beginning of the fifteenth century and that of Oxford are no longer simple suppositions; indeed, that such relations existed was clear to all concerned in the Council of Constance. But in the course of time, when the works of Wiclif became more inaccessible, the consciousness of the close connection between the two reformatory movements fell into the background. But since, during the last few years, the publications concerning Wiclif are commanding more attention, we are gradually perceiving how much Huss was indebted to Wiclif. The first step in this direction has now been made by Professor Loserth, of the University of Czernowitz, under the title of "Huss and Wiclif." This work will be of great value to theological

investigators. Loserth's very thorough and very diligent investigations are from many stand-points of scientific importance. Loserth seems to present valid proof that the Bohemian movement was, in the main, a repetition of the English one; that Wiclif was the highly gifted and energetic master, and Huss the docile scholar.

Dr. Guthe, the famous Palestine explorer, has just published an extended and valuable report of his latest labors in the line of excavations around Jerusalem. The accounts mainly concern the southern wall of ancient Jerusalem, the old sites and buildings on the south-eastern eminence, as well as the surroundings of the Pool of Siloam. Eleven plates of large form, partly lithograph and partly crayon, serve as illustrations; a map based on Wilson's, but corrected by Guthe and Sandel, affords an instructive view of the entire work. The journal of the German Palestine Association has, in the first number of its sixth volume, much interesting matter in regard to the present condition of the inhabitants of Palestine. It has also an article on the names of the squares, streets, and passages of the present Jerusalem by the missionary Sandreczki; also a treatise in regard to the so-called temple associations of Palestine, by one of the co-workers in that enterprise, as well as a description of the workmen and the sphere of work of the German Protestant mission in Jerusalem. The last article of the issue treats of the *personnel* and the condition of the various Christian confessions in the Holy Land, as well as those of the Jewish inhabitants. This German publication is one of the most valuable now issued in regard to contemporaneous activity in Palestine, and is invaluable in its contents to that portion of the Christian world that looks with interest and favor to all that concerns the regeneration of the Holy Land.

Under the title of "Exegetical Commentary to Nine Epistles of the Apostle Paul," we have a new work by Karl von der Heydt. It is to the Germans a gratifying as well as a rare occurrence, that a layman should use his extraordinary genius to throw a brilliant light on the living word of God, and so to delve in the original text of the New Testament as to find and give new significance to many of its words and expressions. The author of this work has discovered a rare worth in these Bible words, and seems greatly to enjoy all their meaning. His exegesis is not given solely on his own responsibility, but is based on the present status of investigation and the commentaries and authorities of the most thorough Greek scholars.

Two Christological works antagonistic in their character have recently appeared to attract the interest of the Christian world. The Ritschel theology has forced the Christological question into a new position by its distinction between metaphysics and dogmatics. but a work now comes to its relief from Alsace, from the pen of Professor Lobstein, in Strasburg. It is in French, and bears the following title: "The Idea of the Pre-existence of the Son of God: A Fragment of Experimental Christology." This work has just been published by the Protestant

house of Fischbacher in Paris. While asserting that he desires to serve neither the liberal nor the orthodox theology, he makes an effort, exegetically and critically, to furnish the proof that in the original New Testament text the idea of pre-existence of the Son of God did not exist. He makes assertions as follows: The Acts of the Apostles acknowledges his eternity only after death, and Peter asserted the pre-existence of Christ only in the thought of God. The Revelation contains the first assertion of a pre-existence of the Messiah. Paul, with rabbinical terminology, takes up the thought, and arrives in later epistles at the assertion that Jesus is to be comprehended as the living principle, and as an independent eternal personality. The Epistle to the Hebrews, on the basis of the Alexandrian philosophizers, makes the Son equal to the Father, as a symbol of his nature, etc. It is plain to be seen, from his short review of the quotations of Lobstein, that he starts from the supposition that the Lord himself has nowhere asserted his pre-existence, and that where it occurs it is only a human construction, and may, therefore, lay no claim to objective authority. He who can satisfy himself with this result of scriptural investigation may see how he will finally fare with his "historical and critical" testimony.

The other Christological work which we have here to name proceeds from a diametrically opposite basis. It is that of the Oxford professor, P. H. Liddon, which has just been published in German, to gratify the theologians of that land with an antidote for the works above named. The title of Liddon's book is, "The Divinity of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ." It is in the form of lectures, with a preface by a pastor of Nice. The views of this subject which we here find are of no extraordinary novelty. The most difficult problems of this Christological question, namely, the relation of the divine nature to the human, as well as the difference between the God-man existence of the Lord in the so-called condition of humiliation and in that of his elevation, is scarcely touched; and, indeed, the mode of treatment which Christology experiences in the school of Ritschel is not even mentioned, much less debated. Nevertheless, the book is calculated to furnish a rich blessing to earnest Christians seeking for a Godlike Christ, and will, doubtless, exert a wide and wholesome influence in Germany, as it has done in England.

ART. XII.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

The Revised Version.—Heb. vi, 4–6: Ἀδύνατον γὰρ τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας γευσαμένους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου καὶ μετόχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ καλὸν γευσαμένους θεο ῥῆμα δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος, ἰκαὶ παραπεσόντας, πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν, ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας.

For it is impossible those once enlightened, having tasted the heavenly gift, and become partakers of the Holy Spirit, and tasted the good word of God, *and* the power of the future state, to renew again unto repentance, *they* recrucifying to themselves the Son of God, and exposing to disgrace.—*Literal rendering.*

For as touching those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come, and *then* fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame.—*Revised Version.*

This passage of Scripture is justly regarded as among the most interesting and solemnly important of the whole Bible. It is interesting as a critical study, since its finer discriminations of meaning can be clearly determined only by careful attention not only to the accepted sense of the words used, but also to the structure of the sentences, and especially to the tenses of the several verbal participles. It is also interesting as a dogmatic study, on account of its direct bearing upon a much-disputed point of the theology of evangelical Protestantism, the possibility or impossibility of the fatal and final apostasy of real Christians; and likewise for its awful lessons and solemn warnings against the sin of apostatizing. It embodies with great fullness and richness of expression the facts and phenomena of Christian experience, and shows the high estate, at once so precious and so perilous, in which the believer stands; and it also seems to intimate that, while a fall from that high estate is supposable, the condition resulting from such a lapse is terrible beyond all comparison.

In respect to its grammatical form and structure, the passage is not a difficult one. The words used are not unusual ones, nor do they appear to be carried out of their ordinary application, and the whole structure of the sentence is agreeable to the best understood and universally accepted grammatical rules. A certain process (to renew again unto repentance) is indicated as *impossible* (*ἀδύνατον*) to the class of persons who are included under the four designations (the last one twofold) first given, and who have fallen away from that state; and a further explanation

is added showing that this impossibility is conditioned and rendered irreversible by the position and practice of those who have so fallen away, because they "recrucify" and "contemn" Christ. In respect to the grammatical sense of the whole passage, there is really no difficulty at all, and the objections raised against allowing it to be accepted and understood as it seems obviously to mean arise simply from dogmatic reasons, as teaching one or more points of doctrine that stand opposed to certain other accepted beliefs.

It is the established and the only defensible rule for interpretation of a discourse, spoken or written, that it shall be understood agreeably to the ordinary sense of its words and phrases, and where that is clearly ascertained there can be no appeal from its determination. The rule sometimes insisted upon, that particular texts (and the whole Bible is made up of such) must be interpreted agreeably to "the analogy of faith," can be legitimately used only when all other methods fail, and then the passages so interpreted cannot be employed as proof-texts. As an element in criticism dogmatic considerations must always occupy a very low place, and they must be used, if at all, only with very great caution, and when other and more rational processes fail to give any probable sense to the matter in hand—a consideration which certainly will not apply in this case.

The purport and design of the discourse of which the passage under consideration is a part should be clearly apprehended and its bearing properly conceded. Accordingly, we find the evident intent of the Epistle to the Hebrews to have been to dissuade those addressed from apostatizing from their Christian fidelity, toward which there seem to have been among them, at that time, strong incentives. The passage therefore appears as giving a reason why the threatened defection should not be allowed to take place, and the motive urged is the certain, fearful, and irreversible perdition of those who so apostatize.

The persons in whose interests these instructions appear to be given are indicated by certain facts that are assumed to belong to their history, and by referring to certain spiritual attainments to which they had come; the whole taken together constituting a deep and broad presentation of the religious or spiritual life, having very few parallels in accurate delineation of personal experience and Christian attainments.

The adverb of time or order, ἅπαξ, applies naturally to all of the first four terms or clauses, which are all in one or other of

the preterit tenses, and it accordingly gives to all of them an historical value, as if it were said that these things having taken place, and now still another important fact having intervened, the inevitable outcome must be considered. As a fact, the case is no doubt a supposed one, and yet its pertinency for the use to which it is put supposes something more than its possibility. It indeed seems to say to those addressed that, having themselves been made the subjects of the things named as having once (ἅπαξ) occurred, and being now tempted to "fall away," they have need to be warned of the fearful consequences that would be sure to follow such a backsliding. Respecting their experience, they are first spoken of as *having been enlightened*, φωτισθέντας, a term often met with in both the Septuagint and the New Testament, meaning primarily "to bring to light," or "to cast light upon;" but a little later, and especially among the early Christian writers, it is used in the sense of "being enlightened," and in that sense it was used to indicate the work of the Spirit in the conversion of the soul. (See chapter x, 32.) After the apostolic age, and when baptism had become the accepted synonym for regeneration, that ceremony was styled the "illumination;" but even then, as is shown by Suicer, (*sub voce*,) "the word never came to simply and purely signify outward baptism, but it always included (in its meaning) that *illumination* of the new birth which is the thing signified in the sacrament." Erasmus coincides with this, and describes those here spoken of as having been "once enlightened," as those "who had escaped from the darkness of their former life, being illuminated by the doctrine of the Gospel," which evidently pertained to the heart no less than to the outward understanding, so making these illuminated ones the truly regenerate.

This first clause, as naming a single past event, is expressed in the indefinite past tense, but the second, indicating a continuous experience, is in a tense which brings the action down to the immediate past—"having tasted"—γευσαμένους—having been all along tasting—"the heavenly gift," the peculiar gifts of the Spirit of which only real believers partake. "This heavenly gift," says Alford, "these persons are supposed to have tasted for themselves." And thus it would appear that the whole process must fall within the sphere of the personal spiritual consciousness.

The effort is made by a class of Biblical interpreters in order to meet the exigencies of their dogmatic pre-determinations, to

evade the force of this language by minifying the word "taste," (γευσαμένους, twice used,) so that it shall mean not really *partaking of*, or *feeding upon*, but only testing by the organ of taste —a rendering directly opposed to the use of the same term elsewhere, (Psa. xxx, 8; Matt. xvi, 28; John viii, 52; 1 Peter ii, 3,) and manifestly used only as a makeshift, and yet it has been accepted by not a few able and respectable divines. Dr. Doddridge sees "no necessity for extending, in this place, the energy of the Spirit beyond his *extraordinary* (outward) gifts," and instances Simon Magus as an example. Stuart, with characteristic candor, confesses that the words, taken as usually employed, would imply that the persons described were real Christians; but he thinks they *may be used* in a lower sense, which, in obedience to the demands of his traditional creed, he seems to timidly prefer. Dr. Cowles, of Oberlin, concedes that the text speaks of real Christians, but most absurdly claims that the cases here given are only supposititious, and such as can never be realized; and in all this he is substantially repeating what was before said by his great exemplar, Rev. Albert Barnes, who dissents from Stuart's half-assumed position that a lower state of grace than actual conversion is intended; but still he holds fast, with a kind of death-grasp desperation, to the doctrine of the indefectibility of the saints. "It is not," says he, "an affirmation that any *had* actually fallen away, or that in fact they *would* do it; but the statement is, that on the supposition *that they had fallen away* it would be impossible to renew them again." We confess our inability to appreciate the intellectual condition of any one who could soberly assume such a position. The question is not as to what *had* actually occurred, or *would* occur, but the essential conditions of the problem in hand require that the conditions named shall be possible—that they *might* occur; and the *possibility* of falling away is precisely the question at issue. If there could be no *falling away* there was really no danger, and the warning uttered was based upon a falsehood, and there could be no condition admitting of a renewing unto repentance, and so the whole thing must appear as a solemn farce, a bugaboo with which to alarm children about fictitious but really impossible perils. We are asked to believe that the inspired teacher knew very well that their actual fall was sure not to occur, and yet he speaks of it as not only possible, but so likely to take place, that the utmost carefulness ought to be exercised to prevent it, and for that purpose he pictures the horrible ruin that would follow that

impossible event, *should it only take place*, which it is "morally certain" it never will!

We find our own views happily expressed in the subjoined remarks of Dr. S. H. Turner, ("Commentary on Hebrews,") which are at once moderate in tone but forceful. After presenting the arguments noticed above at length, he says:

> Such a mode of reasoning appears to me wholly unsatisfactory. The object of the apostle is to prevent the actual falling away of the persons whom he describes as real Christians, and with this view he sets before them the horrors of a state of apostasy. It is incredible that he should feel and show such concern to prevent what he knew could not occur. Such *a statement* might indeed be made, but such *a moral motive* could not be presented by an inspired or judicious man to free moral agents. It were preposterous to offer motives in order to dissuade creatures from falling over a precipice who were physically in a condition which made such a fall impossible. And as to the *use* of such a warning, it may well be asked, What practical good effect can result from showing the greatness of a merely hypothetical sin, which can never possibly occur? And surely there are real sins enough to warn men against, without denouncing threats against such as are merely supposable. With equal consistency the Universalist might allow that the doctrine of future and eternal punishment is revealed, [in Scripture,] and yet regard the representation as made simply in order to deter men from sinning.

The impossibility (*ἀδύνατον*) of renewing unto repentance (*ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν*) those who have fallen away (*παραπεσόντας*) is declared to be because they are (present—*now*) recrucifying (*ἀναστανροῦντας*) and putting to shame (*παραδειγματίζοντας*) the Son of God. The form of the declaration is in no sense uncertain, or within itself other than absolute and indicative of something sure to occur. "The import of the expression," says Luneman, "is absolute, and to weaken it into *per difficile est*, (as some have done,) according to which we should have to suppose a rhetorical exaggeration, would be an act of caprice. Nor may we assume (as some others have) that the impossibility is wholly on man's part, and not at all on the part of God. The impossibility of this renewing is, in itself, emphasized only on the part of its efficient agent, (God.) Had it been otherwise, the passive and not the active form of the verb would have been used." The impossibility in the case is, therefore, as to man, *objective* rather than *subjective*. Since "there is no other name given under heaven, nor among men, whereby we may be saved, but Christ Jesus;" if he is rejected "there remains no more" (no other way of) "remission of sin, but a fearful looking for of judgment."

It is important that we observe, that while all the preceding propositions, indicating both the religious experiences and the falling away, are expressed in the past tense, this one—the *recrucifying*, etc.—is in the present, and of course the act itself is continuous; and so long as that is the case repentance and restoration

are absolutely precluded. "The question," says Alford, "is not whether man's ministry or God's power is to be supplied as the agent, nor even whether the verb is active or passive; the impossibility lies merely within the limits of the hypothesis itself. Whether God in his infinite mercy and almighty power will ever by judgment, or by the strong workings of his Spirit, reclaim the obdurate sinner, so that even *he* may look upon Him whom he has has pierced, is—thank him—a question which neither this nor any other passage of Scripture precludes us from entertaining." And, on the other hand, it should be noted that no passage of Scripture, legitimately interpreted, casts the faintest ray of hope into that abyss of spiritual ruin which the rejecters of Christ have taken as their alternative portion.

By another class than those already referred to, (sometimes, however, very nearly related to them,) this passage has been understood to teach the utter impossibility of the recovery of those who have apostatized,—those who, having been truly converted, have turned again to sin, and rejected Christ and his salvation. But the text itself does not proceed to that extent; and since the presumed "impossibility" is conditioned on the continuous recrucifixion and exposing to obloquy of Christ, if a cessation of doing this is supposable, then may there be a possibility of renewal unto repentance. On that point this passage makes no utterance, either for or against such a hope; and while on the one hand the oft-reiterated declarations respecting the divine long-suffering and tender mercies give room for the hope that even such may be recovered and saved, on the other hand the whole tone of this passage, and still more so the parallel one in the tenth chapter, is fearfully significant of the almost absolutely hopeless condition of the soul that, having been raised to such heights of grace, *willfully* rejects, crucifies anew, and casts open reproach upon the Son of God in his relation of the Saviour of men. The shutting up of the possibility of this sin to the times and circumstances of the early Jewish Church—as seems to be Dr. Clarke's view—does not appear to be in accordance with either the evident design of the warning nor with the language used. It is still a fearful truth, universally applicable, that "a gracious soul may fall from grace;" and a joyful one that we are not forbidden to hope, to pray, and to labor for the restoration of those the farthest gone in apostasy. And still the solemn thought remains, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."

Studies in the Christian Evidences. By ALEXANDER MAIR, D.D., Morningside, Edinburgh. Crown 8vo, pp. 399. New York: Scribner & Welford.

Dr. Mair has given us an excellent book. It consists of a series of discussions, eleven in number, of selected fundamental points in the Christian Evidences, intended especially to meet the wants of those in the Church and out of it who have become perplexed, though not convinced, by the religious doubts and difficulties of the age. Starting from simple Theism as an accepted basis, it leads us, by a path of beautifully lucid and scholarly argument, into the center of the Christian system.

Taking up first "Christianity and Physical Science," Dr. Mair concedes that the present age has its full share of unbelief, though he denies it to be greater than in the latter part of the eighteenth century. He doubtless speaks of Great Britain. We know it in this country to be less. Nevertheless, these are times of skepticism. Much of it is nebulous, and more is simply the fog arising from inability to solve the adroitly put queries of infidels. Positive unbelief now takes mainly the form of blank atheism or materialism, or, if it calls itself by some other name, it ultimately comes to the denial of a personal God. Largely conducive to these results is the fact that this is emphatically the age of physical science, which demands methods of proof peculiar to itself. Its field is the world of matter; its instruments are the five senses. Its method of proof, the easiest known to men, is perfectly good within its own domain, and totally inapplicable out of it.

There is, rightly viewed, no antagonism between Christianity and physical science. Their methods of proof are entirely different. The facts and truths of religion and criticism cannot be ascertained by the chemist's crucible or the geologist's hammer, any more than Kepler's laws can be proved from the testimony of consciousness. Nor does eminence in physical science give weight to one's testimony in a department which he has never studied. A theologian who is nothing else is of no authority in chemistry; a chemist who is nothing else is of no authority in geology; nor is a physicist who is nothing else than a physicist of any authority in religion. No greater absurdity can be found in the present age than the assumption to subject historical events and moral questions to the tests of physical proof, and no blindness is greater than that of men who first determine that only matter and force exist in the universe, and then shut their eyes to the proper proofs of Christianity and declare that nothing is to be seen. Happily, the larger proportion of physicists in the

foremost rank are of another sort, and stand with Brewster, Faraday, Thomson, Gray, Dawson, and Winchell as believers in Christ.

Yet equally absurd and blind is the class of unbelievers, not mere physicists, who subject the facts and truths of Christianity to their previously established philosophy. Thus, Baur pronounces the question of supernatural or no supernatural to be a "purely philosophical question." Strauss holds that "an event cannot be historical which is inconsistent with the known and otherwise universal laws of phenomena." Renan declares it "an absolute rule of criticism to grant no place in historical narratives to miraculous circumstances." They start with the idea that the supernatural is impossible, and then, dismissing the evidence for it, coolly set themselves at explaining away as they best can whatever savors of the supernatural. They thus prejudge the whole question beforehand, and disqualify themselves for a hearing.

In considering the "Intellectual Difficulties in Religion," Dr. Mair thinks they arise partly from the objects contemplated, and partly from the finiteness of the mind that contemplates them. One of those objects is God, a pure spirit, without form, and infinite. The more we try to comprehend him the deeper is the mystery. The farther we travel in infinity the vaster do we conceive infinity to be. Another object is man, of whom, after all the study of the centuries, we know so little. Whence does he come? What is he? Whither does he go? Of him Goethe truly said, "He knows little of the world, and least of all of himself." And yet this finite man is expected to comprehend the infinite God! To do it he must himself become God. It must be expected, then, that a religion emanating from God will contain difficulties and mysteries and truths that we may not be able to explain, but are nevertheless bound to believe on their own proper evidence. None will more bravely decry this principle than a class of scientists, and yet within their own field they constantly act upon it, and both unquestioningly believe and openly proclaim the facts they have gathered, not an element of which they can explain.

It is hardly conceivable that God could create a being with religious capacities, instincts, and necessities, and leave him to grope his way through the darkness as best he might, with no manifestation of himself and no revelation of his will. The human soul, free to utter its own voice, cries out for nothing in the wide universe as it does for the living God, to whom it may

speak, whom it may hear, and in whose embrace it may lie; and it is incredible that God has no open door for the hearing of this cry and the relief of this want. And who shall say that a revelation of religious truth to men by an infinite God is an impossibility? How such a revelation shall be given, whether vocally, written on stone, or printed in a book, as one man imparts new truth to another, is wholly immaterial. Nor does the question of inspiration, or any particular theory of inspiration, properly come in here, for, as to the New Testament, all our knowledge of any inspiration of it at all is derived from its pages, and it is yet to be settled whether the book itself is truthful and authoritative. This grand question is a historical one, in which the proof is historical proof, and must depend on testimony. The histories of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John have come down to us as have the histories of Xenophon and Tacitus, and are to be judged and received upon the same principles with theirs. Are they competent, trustworthy witnesses of what they saw and heard and learned? If so, their testimony is authoritative, and must be received until it is impeached.

The historical testimony to the New Testament books as productions of the apostolic age is abundant. The three great MSS., the Alexandrine, Vatican, and Sinaitic, carry us to A. D. 350. Back of that time are the Versions, the Fathers with their numerous quotations, some of whom overlap the age of the apostles, as Papias, Polycarp, and Clement of Rome, and the testimony of the heretics themselves, besides the numerous catalogues of the accepted books. The argument is familiar to biblical students. But a long step is gained in the admission by the chief representatives of the school of negative criticism that the first four epistles of St. Paul—Romans, First and Second Corinthians, and Galatians—are genuine and undisputed productions of the apostle, and that he lived at the time usually supposed. These epistles contain a clear, decisive statement of every fundamental historic fact of the Gospel, and their author is a competent, trustworthy witness, unimpeached and unimpeachable.

The study on "The Christian Miracles" is a piece of splendid argument. Its definition of a miracle as a visible result produced in nature by a superhuman agent, and more particularly by the special and direct volition of God, is sufficiently full for the purpose in hand. It does not admit that a miracle is a "violation of the laws of nature," as Hume claims, but, on the contrary, it is an occurrence in the interests of the highest order. In the

gradation of nature we find matter, chemical force, vegetable life, animal life, spiritual life, in which the lower exist and work for the higher. If, now, disease and disorder attack the highest rank, as they have done in man, God may use the lower laws and forces of nature for its restoration to health and order if he sees it best, even though it be by miracle. The possibility of it ought not to be questioned by a believer in a personal God. Physical science never has proved, and never can prove, its impossibility, while its facts do show supernatural intervention on his part. There was, for instance, during unnumbered ages, an established order of things under the laws of nature, when suddenly by the divine volition a living man, thinking, willing, moral, and free, was brought into being. Here was a supernatural new beginning in nature by divine interference. And can not he who created nature and its laws use them and modify them, if he pleases? Every plan of man to which he gives effect in action uses these laws, counteracting them if he holds up a stone, combining and utilizing them if he builds a steam-engine; thus from time to time making new beginnings, and exhibiting what is the very essence of the supernatural. God did this in the creation of man by his power and will, and by the same power and will he manifested himself by miracles in the supernatural beginning of Christianity. Hume argued that miracles are contrary to experience, and so incredible. Well, it is contrary to experience, in Hume's sense, that man should come into the world in any other way than by ordinary birth, which would prove that man has existed from eternity. But science proves that somehow there was a first man, which, on his theory, ought to be incredible. And, after all, the world does believe the most astounding things on trustworthy testimony, and it is contrary to all human experience that such testimony, multiform and cumulative, as we have for the Christian miracles should be false. The direct personal testimony of the sacred writers to miracles, which is the subject of a separate study, and, in particular, that of St. Paul in his four epistles conceded to be genuine, is strongly and conclusively stated. He testifies to receiving revelations, to seeing the risen Christ, to miracles in the early Church, and to having himself performed them among the very people to whom he thus wrote, among whom were bitter opponents of his apostleship, who would have contradicted and exposed him had his statement been otherwise than notoriously true.

The studies on "The Resurrection of Christ" and "The Unique

Personality of Christ" are masterly examinations of their subjects. For them, and also for the two concluding the series, on "Important Converging Lines," with its unique application of the mathematical doctrine of Probabilities, and "Proof from 'Survival of the Fittest,'" we must refer our readers to the volume itself.

The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The Ninth Series of the Cunningham Lectures By GEORGE SMEATON, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College Edinburgh. 8vo, pp. 372. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford.

The motive which led Dr. Smeaton to make the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit the topic of these six lectures was a desire to counteract the influence of "the representatives of modern theology, who, it is well known, have almost wholly ignored it." He had also found it impossible to divest his mind of the impression that, "among those who take religion in earnest, a disposition exists in no small measure to pass over the supernatural agency of the Holy Spirit." To accomplish his purpose he found it necessary to take "a general survey of theology from the viewpoint of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit." To give completeness to the discussion he has given us first a dissertation in which "he endeavors to bring out the testimony of Scripture to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as contained in the Old and New Testaments;" next follow "Six Lectures," which contain "a brief outline or sketch of the positive truth—the form in which the Church dogmatically holds the doctrine." In a "third division" is a "historical survey," or condensed history of the doctrine from the apostolic age to the present time.

In the first part the subject is treated exegetically—at least sufficiently so to "evolve what the Scriptures say," and to show what was the teaching of the prophets, from Moses to Christ, and of the apostles subsequent to the resurrection. To mark the contrast between their doctrine of the Spirit and modern Sabellianism was the writer's leading object. His argument in this part is cumulative and conclusive on the main question; albeit it is not satisfactory to an Arminian thinker where it affirms the invincibility of the Spirit's influence, and asserts the dogma of the necessary final perseverance of those who, being once led by the Spirit, "CANNOT omit duty or neglect privilege."

The scope of the "Six Lectures" is wide, embracing the Personality and Procession of the Holy Spirit, the Work of the Spirit

in the Anointing of Christ, in Revelation and Inspiration; in the Regeneration of Individuals, and in the Church. These transcendently great topics are quite profoundly discussed, with rare dialectic skill, much theological learning, and in a reverent spirit. Yet it must be confessed that the impression resulting from their careful perusal is more perplexing than satisfactory. The sublime problem of the Trinity in Unity remains an unsolved and unsolvable mystery, notwithstanding our author's earnest and able attempt to find a key to its solution. It may, indeed, be honestly questioned whether the effect, on some minds, of his reasonings upon the personality of the Christ and of the Holy Spirit will not be to unsettle rather than to establish their faith in the scriptural doctrine of the Trinity. In treating the distinctions between the divine personalities he frequently pushes his theories so far that, logically extended, they must lead to tritheism. In trying to pilot his readers through the currents of heterodox dogmas, he is so anxious to keep them from striking against the rocks of Sabellianism that he narrowly escapes steering into the vortex of tritheism. Assuredly, his work proves his preliminary assertion, that it is not his province "to explain the mystery of the doctrine of the Trinity." Nevertheless, like one attracted from his purpose by a fascinating object, he ventures to make the impossible explanation. Richard Watson wisely remarks of such ventures: "It would perhaps have been well, if divines, in treating this awful and mysterious subject, had confined themselves to the expressions of Scripture, for the moment we begin to explain it beyond the written word of God we plunge ourselves into inextricable difficulties."

Following the "Six Lectures" is a brief "historical survey of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit," in which the developments of the doctrine, and the discussions to which it has given rise during the progress of the centuries, are traced, not in detail, but in outline; touching only marked epochs in the history of the doctrine, and condensing a multitude of historic facts into small spaces. This is admirably done, excepting in its anti-Arminian passages. Dr. Smeaton is an ultra-Calvinist, as he shows most unmistakably both in the Lectures and in this dissertation. Hence his views of the work of the Holy Spirit are determined by the Genevan theology, which he freely applies both to the doctrine of the Spirit and its development in the Church. He does this with an unshrinking dogmatism which might dispose a reader unversed in the history of theological discussions to fancy

that the great body of the Christian Church accepted Calvinism as the truth, and that its opponents rank, by general consent, as errorists. It is refreshingly cool, in view of both the past and the present status of that theology, to be told by this really able writer that Arminianism "insinuated itself into the Reformed Church and became a very formidable power which spread in all directions, and *can scarcely even yet be said to have spent its force!*" Perhaps if the learned doctor would look beyond little Scotland, and out into the great world, he would discover genuine Arminianism—not the numerous types of error to which its adversaries unjustly gave its name—to be, not a force nearly spent, but a power so formidable and growing as to be leading all the Churches back to that faith in the universality of the atonement, in the freedom of the human will, in election conditioned on faith, and in the efficacy of the Spirit's operations except in those who persistently resist him, which was the common possession of the Church before the time of Augustine. If this book is to be taken as evidence that Scottish theologians intend to revive the declining power of old Calvinism as a means of counteracting the influence of the "New Theology," its appearance is to be regretted, since nothing would more surely promote that theology than the revival of that unscriptural system.

Clark's Foreign Theological Library. Fourth Series. Vol. XXIII. Keil's Introduction to the Old Testament. 8vo, pp. 529. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1871.

Our readers are informed, by a passage quoted in our notice of Dr. Ladd, that the only leading thinker in Germany who still maintains the "traditional" view of the Old Testament Canon is Keil. He is the Abdiel in the general defection, "faithful among the faithless," who pays no homage to the *Grundschrift*. Accordingly his Introduction presents the best view as yet accessible to the readers of English alone of the Pentateuchal question. Its last edition was issued by the author in 1868, and the date of the translator's issue is 1869. It is too early for the later manifestoes of Kuenen, Wèllhausen, and Robertson Smith. The opponents it meets are De Wette, Bleek, Tuch, and Reihm. As an Introduction it may well be read by our theological students in addition to Harman's. And to those awakened by the present aspects of the Pentateuchal discussion its pages will possess a special interest. The style is now and then clumsy, and should have been a little straightened by the translator, Prof. Douglas; but

the additional bracketed passages, by the editor, are uniformly pertinent and valuable.

When he comes to the treatment of the Five Books of Moses, Keil opens his battery upon the *Grundschrift*, or, as he significantly styles it, "the imaginary Fundamental Document," which the manipulations of the disintegrationists have professed to find as the Pentateuchal skeleton. He spreads before us the ground-scripts of Tuch and Bleek, and gives full exhibition of Dr. Davidson's programme of the respective parts of the Elohist, the Younger Elohist, the Jehovist, and the Redactor, a programme which at once demonstrates its own absurdity. To the investigating student Professor Douglas gives the following suggestion how to manage with the Elohistic, Jehovistic, etc., contributions:

> If any one wishes to study the subject in his Hebrew Bible for himself, perhaps no way will be found at once so easy and so thorough as to conceive of the existing Pentateuch as if it were the result of successive deposits or strata, and to paint them with different colors, as the geologist paints the successive deposits or strata on his map. For instance, let him leave the fundamental document untouched by the natural whiteness of the paper. Let him give a blue tint to the Jehovist, and a yellow tint to the Vor-Elohist of *Vaihinger*, or the Younger Elohist of Davidson, (for these will be found to have much in common;) and let him reserve the red, which is sorer on the eyes, for the rarer work of the Redactor. Immediately the composition of the Pentateuch, according to the critical school, will stand out distinctly before him.

Keil then gives an analysis of the skeleton, showing, first, that while it pretends to furnish a continuous fabric it presents lamentable gaps, vertebræ absent from its spine, and missing members of its corporeity. He shows that the eliminated parts of the text are tied to the skeleton by distinct references, and presuppose a unity, and, on the whole, obliterates the imaginary dividing line.

How small the capital upon which the Elohistic-Jehovistic theorists do business is manifest from the extreme fewness of the passages in which either one of the names is used exclusively. The following statement tells the whole story:

> (A.) *Elohim* alone occurs in ch. i–ii, 3, (the creation of heaven and earth;) xix, 29–38, (Lot's departure from Zoar, and settlement in the mountains of Edom;) xxv, 1–11, (Abraham's last marriage, children, death, and burial;) xxvii, 46–xxviii. 9, (Jacob's dismission from his father's house;) and i, (Jacob's burial and Joseph's death.) (B.) Jehovah alone, in ch. x, xi, (table of the nations, confusion of tongues, Shem's genealogy; xii, xiii, (Abraham's journey to Canaan and Egypt;) xxiv, (Rebekah engaged, and brought to be the wife of Isaac;) xxviii, 10–22, (Jacob's dream at Bethel;) and xxxviii, (Judah's incest.) (C.) The two names conjoined only in ch. ii, 4–iii, 24, (paradise and the fall;) in fact, Jehovah-Elohim united twenty times, and Elohim alone three times; then alternating in ch. iv, (Adam's sons, Cain's fratricide, and his descendants.) In all the other sections we find other names of God along with these: *Ha-Elohim*, both in our Elohistic context (v, 22, 24; vi, 9, 11, etc.) and in a Jehovistic context, (vi, 2, 4;

xx, 17; xxvii, 28;) in addition, *Adonai* only in addresses to God or conversations with God, in a Jehovistic context, xv, 2, 8; xviii, 3, 27, 30–32; xix, 18, and in one that is Elohistic, xx, 4. *El* in Genesis and Exodus only as an appellative, with various epithets to determine the conception more precisely, xiv, 18–20, 22; xxi, 33; xvii, 1; xxviii, 3; xxxv, 11; xlviii, 3; xvi, 13; xxxv, 7; xlix, 25; xxxiii, 20, and others besides, not only in so-called Elohistic portions, like xiv, [?] xxviii, xxxi, xxxiii, xxxv, xliii, xlvi, and xlviii, but also in the Jehovistic portions, like xvi, 13, and in closest connection with Jehovah, xvii, 1, and xxi, 33.

He then furnishes a theory of the principle that guided the sacred writers in the use of the respective names. The translator, however, properly interposes the remark, that while there will be a manifest propriety often guiding a writer which term to use, yet the distinction would often be overlooked, and either term be used indiscriminately. We might illustrate this view by the uses of the two names, Jesus and Christ.

History of the Christian Church. By PHILIP SCHAFF. A New Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Vol. III.—Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity, from Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great, A. D. 311–600. 8vo, pp. 1049. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

It is a matter of very small concern to the public how Dr. Schaff is able to accomplish the more than herculean labors that are continually brought into view by his publishers, ostensibly as his own, It is, however, a matter of very great interest, and a cause for a profound satisfaction, that such works as appear over his name are prepared and published. To be able to render available other people's labors, in whatever calling one may be engaged, is a faculty scarcely less admirable than the ability to do large things by one's own efforts; and in respect to available productiveness, the latter is often of the better quality. In some way Dr. Schaff contrives to be a wonderfully prolific author, without falling into the usual faults of mere compilers of books.

About twenty years ago he began issuing his "History of the Christian Church," of which the third and last volume, coming down to A. D. 600, appeared in 1867. Of the public estimate of that work it is enough to say that it successfully contested the field with Neander's great work; and by improving the advantages afforded by the lapse of time, and the researches and discussions of later writers, some valuable improvements were made. He now returns to revise, enlarge, and greatly enrich his own work, and has at length the great satisfaction, so often denied veteran authors, of seeing the revisal completed, and the whole work in its rejuvenated form appear—a finished production.

The work, as it now appears, is much more than simply a

revision, with corrections and emendations, of the former one, being largely a new production in respect to both the matter and its arrangement. The history of the whole period from the Advent down to A. D. 311 was comprised in the first volume (528 pages) of the former work; but in this one, two whole volumes (I and II) are given to the same period; and this third volume of the new work is enlarged so as to comprehend what constituted the former second and third volumes. The period thus traversed is among the most deeply important in the history of the whole post-apostolical Church, not less so than that of the Reformation. It was especially the period of great men—Constantine the Great and Julian the Apostate; St. Anthony and St. Benedict; Athanasius and Arius; Augustine and Pelagius, and of Leo the Great. It was the period of theological development and organization, of heresies and counter-heresies, of synods and councils, in which nearly every form of theological opinion that has since appeared in the Church was propounded and canvassed with a degree of force and acumen that has scarcely since been equaled. These things are brought forward in this history with a satisfactory degree of fullness, and in such order and with the kind of grouping of subjects and events that help to a ready appreciation of the whole subject. No doubt, as in every case, the predilections of the writer unconsciously affect his statements. The author's own views may be traced in his writing; and while making due allowance for these, it may still be said that very few works of the kind are so free from that kind of faults.

The Faiths of the World. St. Giles's Lectures. 12mo, pp. 364. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

This volume contains twelve lectures by eleven leading Scottish divines, treating Brahminism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Religion of Persia, Religion of Ancient Egypt, Religion of Ancient Greece, Religion of Ancient Rome, Teutonic and Scandinavian Religion, Ancient Religions of Central America, Judaism, Mohammedanism, and Christianity in relation to other Religions. Of necessity so many themes discussed in so small a volume cannot be treated exhaustively nor in detail. Hence these very able lectures are condensations, pictures in broad outline of the central features in the faiths of mankind. They give the results of much patient study on the part of their highly accomplished writers, who, having intelligently grasped the characteristic principles of the religions of the world, show why they existed, why

they spread, wherein they failed, and what are the points of contact between our Christianity and those false systems which still continue to exist. Hence the book is not unworthy to be regarded as an introduction to the "great science of comparative theology," deserving the attention of advanced students, and especially of those busy laymen whose innumerable duties forbid profound research, but who desire sufficient insight into the religious thought of the world to establish them in their conviction that, the more thorough is one's acquaintance with false theologies, the more ready will one be to subscribe to the truth of the final sentence in this volume, that "not one of the features or doctrines of Christianity will fail to appear in a brighter sight and with a diviner beauty after they have been compared and contrasted with the correlative features and doctrines of other religions."

The Life of Christ. By Dr. BERNHARDT WEISS, Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated by M. G. HOPE. Vol. II. 8vo, pp. 403. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford.

In the pretended form of a life-story of Jesus of Nazareth, many modern writers, and especially those of Germany, have found opportunity to re-examine and restate the historical and doctrinal contents of the four evangelists, and to make of them just what their own predilections called for. "The Life of Christ" by Dr. Weiss differs very considerably from all others, being widely separated from those of both Strauss and Renan, and about equally far from those of Hase and Schenkel; and yet he will not be accepted as a safe authority by the evangelical Churches of Protestantism. There are peculiarities in the German methods of thinking and writing which the more direct and logical Anglo-Saxon fails to appreciate, and this unlikeness of methods renders much that seems to be especially learned and profound in many German works practically unavailable for English readers. This work seems to be of this class. It is learned, able, and thoughtful; it accepts the supernatural and the spiritual in the Gospel, recognizes Christ's divinity, and, in some sort, the inspiration of the Scriptures; but his way of viewing and putting these things is not such as to commend his work to English-speaking Christians. Some of his discussions, as that on "The Demoniac," and "The Leper," are interesting, but unsatisfactory. Whether for critical or for devotional purposes, better books on the same subject may be found that have not come to us from another language.

A Popular History of Christian Doctrine. By T. G. CRIPPEN. 8vo, pp. 357. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford.

The author of this comprehensive compendium enters upon his work with a profession of modesty that seems scarcely to be called for, in view of its character—that it is designed for a class of readers who may not be "able to appreciate the scholarly works of Hagenbach, Shedd, and Cunningham," for, though less voluminous than those, there is no reason why its scholarly qualities should be depreciated in advance. The author's plan is, after a preliminary statement of the "Sources of Religious (Theological) Knowledge," to examine the several chief subjects of doctrine, in order, tracing them in their manifestation from the apostolic times to the present. The discussions of the several points, which he presents in eleven classes, are necessarily brief, and yet they are so presented as to clearly indicate the subject with the principal arguments on both sides. For most readers, even for most ministers of the Gospel, this amount of reading will suffice; but if any wish to go further, this work will prove a valuable introduction to the subject, and a desirable guide to further and fuller sources of information. The author's own opinions, which seem to accord with those of the Scotch Presbyterians, are quite obvious at a variety of points, while some subjects, now much disputed, are readily disposed of, and the disfavored views quietly dismissed as "heresies." His information in respect to the doctrinal positions of some now existing bodies is often at fault, *vide* Methodism on Baptism. The chapter on "Last Things" is suggestive, but not of the final settlement of the questions involved. The Appendixes are especially valuable.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Creation; or, the Bible Cosmogony in the Light of Modern Science. By ARNOLD GUYOT, LL.D., Blair Professor of Geology and Physical Geography in the College of New Jersey; Author of "Earth and Man," Member of the National Academy of Sciences in America. Associate Member of the Royal Academy of Turin, etc., etc. 16mo, pp. 136. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1884. Price, $1 50.

This admirable volume is an antidote to the attempts of some men of science to array the testimony of nature against the cosmogony of Moses. Its author, whose scientific knowledge cannot be truthfully questioned, believes that nature bears witness to the order of creation as stated in the book of Genesis.

The grounds of this conviction Professor Guyot lucidly sets forth in sixteen brief chapters, in which the descriptions of the cosmogonic week given by Moses are first subjected to expository treatment, and then compared with what the earth and the heavens now reveal concerning the order of their creation. In stating the results of his inquiries he says: "To a sincere and unprejudiced mind it must be evident that these great outlines are the same as those which modern science enables us to trace. . . . Whatever be the opinion which we may entertain as to the correctness of the history of the creation of the universe and the earth, such as the present results of inductive science can furnish, we may affirm that the best explanation science is now able to give on this great topic is also that which best explains, in all its details, the first chapter of Genesis, and does it justice."

French and German Socialism in Modern Times. By RICHARD J. ELY, Prof. in Johns Hopkins University. 16mo, pp. 274. New York: Harper & Bros. 1883.

This valuable and interesting history illustrates how largely the differences of human conditions are based in stupendous differences of human character. For the very narrative of socialism is a narrative of a succession of eminent characters, of mind-monarchs, who towered above the humble masses whose condition they studied and toiled to elevate. The line is almost as unbroken as the line of French kings before Louis XVI. They were men of great heads and great hearts, and their labors may not be evil to mankind. In our own country the immense and ever-widening distance between the millionaires and paupers is matter for profound thought. We are by no means free from danger. Our two palliatives are universal suffrage, which greatly forestalls resorts to violence, and the absence of entails, which divides up great estates. But legislation must have a sharp eye to the dangers of war between capital and toil.

Locke's Theory of Knowledge. With a notice of Berkeley. By JAMES M'COSH, D.D., LL.D., D.L., President of Princeton College; Author of "Method of Divine Government," "Intuitions," "Laws of Discursive Thought," "Emotions," etc. 8vo, pp. 77. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1884. Price, 50 cents.

This pamphlet is No. 5 of a series of philosophic tracts which aim to disseminate among the people right views of the leading principles and facts in modern philosophy. The name of the author is sufficient guarantee of the value of his work.

History, Biography, and Topography.

History of the Literature of the Scandinavian North from the Most Ancient Times to the Present. By FREDERICK WINKEL HORN, Ph.D. Revised by the Author, and Translated by RASMUS B. ANDERSON, Author of "Norse Mythology," "America Not Discovered by Columbus," "Viking Tales of the North," and Other Works. With a Bibliography of the Important Books in the English Language Relating to the Scandinavian Countries. Prepared for the Translator by THORVALD SOLBERG, of the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 8vo, pp. x, 507. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. New York: Baker, Pratt, & Co. 1884. Price, $3 50.

The publication in this country, a little more than forty years ago, of translations of Frederika Bremer's stories of Swedish life and of Hans Christian Andersen's Danish tales, legends, and fairy stories at once turned a large popular attention to those lands, which was greatly increased by the appearance, a few years later, of Bayard Taylor's account of his travels in Sweden, Denmark, and Lapland. Since that period there has been a growing interest in the Scandinavian peoples and their literature. To this several things have contributed, among which are the work of evangelical Christian missions in those countries, the excellent character of our Scandinavian population, the introduction to our acquaintance by translations of more or less of the old literature of the fatherland, and, in particular, the production of original works in this country. In this Mr. Anderson is among the foremost, if not the chief. His "Norse Mythology" and "The Scandinavian Languages: Their Historical, Linguistic, Literary, and Scientific Value," not only attest their author's scholarship, but have aided in the creation of a demand for a wider opening into the field of Norse literature. Chicago is the chief center of American original supply, and from its press has already issued quite a library of standard volumes. Yet the bibliographical references in English to Scandinavian countries number about two thousand, while a list of the titles of English translations from Scandinavian authors fills nearly thirty pages.

Very naturally, therefore, a history of this literature has become a desideratum for popular use, as well as for the student's table, and Dr. Horn has very ably supplied it. His work divides into three parts: I. "The Old Norse and Icelandic Literature;" II. "Denmark and Norway;" and III. "Sweden." The old Norse properly continues to near the close of the fourteenth century, when modern Icelandic begins, although the modifying influences of Christianity were earlier felt.

The date of the severance of the Scandinavian branch from

the great Gothic-Germanic, or Teutonic, stock cannot be definitely ascertained, though it is assumed to have occurred at about the time of the birth of Christ. Its people were rude and brave, who became the dread vikings, loving battle and adventure, and by no means destitute of a high degree of barbaric culture. Independent knights they were who brooked no superior, and when monarchy was established in Norway the best and proudest preferred emigration to submission. Iceland thus was settled by people of the noblest birth, or, as Dr. Horn says, "the flower of the nation." Here was the real home of the Old Norse, where it flourished in its beauty and glory. Tradition preserved among them the unwritten books that they had brought over the sea, and the later productions born after the settlement of the island. They told the stories of their ancient gods, and sang the exploits of their noble heroes. And when Christianity came, their chiefs became their priests and were interested in perpetuating the old culture and the old history, even though Odin and Thor were with Jupiter and Mars relegated to the realm of fable. They were ready for the art of writing long before it reached them. The Eddas are simply fragments, some of which belong to the turbulent times of the vikings, and others reach farther back to a period of greater refinement. The skalds were the poet-laureates and history-tellers, the Homers and Tennysons of their times. Of the form of their verse we could here give the reader but little idea, but its laws were as established as those of the Greek or Latin, and much more difficult. There must be meter, alliteration, rhyme, and abundant ornament. In metaphors it is extravagant. Thus gold is "Freyja's tears," because Freyja is said to have shed golden tears when deserted by her husband. But who can interpret the following from an Icelandic skald? "The moon of the eyebrows of the white-clad goddess of the onion soup shone beaming on me as that of a falcon from the clear heaven of the eyebrows, but the beaming splendor from the moon of the eyelids of the goddess of the gold ring causes since then the unhappiness of me and of the goddess of the ring." In plain prose it means, "The eye of the woman clad in white shone beaming on me as that of a falcon from her forehead, but the beaming splendor of her eye causes my and her unhappiness."

The relation of Christianity to Scandinavian literature, and the influence upon it of the printing-press and the Reformation, constitute most interesting passages in this history. Coming from Germany, they first appear in Denmark. The new culture

sought in the universities at Cologne, Heidelberg, Paris, and elsewhere turned thought into the direction of theology, philosophy, and the canon law, to the damage of the popular spirit. But the time came again when the work done was for the people, and from their ranks sprang many of the most powerful intellects of the age.

It is instructive to follow the steps by which the trammels of foreign culture are thrown off and a new national spirit aroused which settles a language and builds a literature of its own, which revives its old antiquity, and at the same time enters upon a new and expanding life. The successive phases of this progress are graphically described by our author, with the names and works of many authors who are reflecting honor on their age and country. "Blood is thicker than water," and though they be four peoples yet are they one Scandinavia.

Echoes from Palestine. By Rev. J. W. MENDENHALL, A. M., Ph.D. With Seventy Illustrations. 8vo, pp. 736. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. New York: Phillips & Hunt. 1883.

Dr. Mendenhall is not "a gatherer and disposer of other men's stuff," nor an imitator of "the thousand and one" travelers who have told the story of their travels in the Holy Land. He is an independent, original observer and thinker, and has produced a volume which, though treating of men and places hackneyed by multitudinous descriptions, is as fresh, entertaining, and instructive as if its subject were unfamiliar. Much of this freshness is attributable to its author's purpose not to make it "like a picture from an old negative," but a record of the impressions made on his own mind by what he saw. It was his purpose not to write as a mere sight-seer, nor as the composer of a diary, but as a student viewing Bible truth in the light of his personal observations on the scenes in which its events occurred and its most distinguished characters lived and moved. In his opening "Statement" its author says: "The book is not, therefore, primarily a panorama of travel, but a panorama of truth, with Syrian landscapes for the background."

Dr. Mendenhall, pursuant to this purpose, first sketches with sufficient fullness for general readers the topography of such parts of the Holy Land as were embraced in his tour from Jaffa to Jerusalem, and from the Dead Sea to the sources of the Jordan. This part of his work shows that while enthusiastically alive to the great events which make those places memorable and sacred, he did

not suffer his enthusiasm to cast a false glamour over the scenes amid which they were enacted. He viewed them, not through his imagination, but simply with open eyes. Hence, for example, he discovers no beauty, as other writers have done, in the women of Bethlehem. With more frankness than gallantry, he says, "Nothing has surprised me more than the extolling, on the part of travelers, of the women of Bethlehem for their beauty, even the guide-books . . . pronouncing them the rivals of the beautiful and graceful women of Nazareth. Whether from lack of appreciation of Oriental beauty, or from a disposition to be independent in our mode of thinking, we have to write that the usual report on this subject is a fiction." Writing of Jerusalem, while admitting that if viewed from the Mount of Olives Jerusalem presents a stately appearance, he claims that when approached from the west "no vision of beauty, no scene of magnificence, Oriental or otherwise, captures the senses." Within its walls he saw it to be, as Lieutenant Conder writes, "a very ugly city. There is nothing in its site or architecture, as a whole, which can save it from the imputation of ugliness." His estimate of the Jordan is equally realistic. He found its waters "too muddy for clean bathing, too swift for navigation, not typical of any thing bright or beautiful; . . . its approaches are unpleasant; its currents make it dangerous; contact with it is defiling." Curiously enough, he finds an argument in this river against immersion as John's method of baptizing. "It is evident," he says, "that if the beach was as muddy in the days of John as it now is, candidates could not get to the water's edge; if the river was as swift as it is now, it would have been unsafe for any except the strong to enter the water; and again, if the river held in solution the alluvial deposits of its banks, John himself would have forbidden baptism in it. With an irrepressible immersionist this may have no weight, but with the traveler on the spot it is usually decisive of all controversy." But, notwithstanding these illustrations of our author's disposition to paint things just as he saw them, and as he would if they were barren of sacred associations, it must not be supposed that he viewed Palestine in the spirit of an iconoclast seeking to destroy impressions made on the Christian public by his predecessors in travel. On the contrary, wherever he finds the beautiful in art or nature he delights to do it ample justice.

The characteristic feature of this volume is found in its combination of doctrinal dissertations and serious reflections with

topographical descriptions and historical statements. In this respect it is a piece of mosaic work, ingeniously and quite artistically wrought. Each place he visited suggests its topic. Jaffa, for example, brings up Jonah and the whale, Peter's vision, and Dorcas, the "patron saint of the sewing circle," each of whom, Peter especially, is pertinently and sensibly discussed. The Jordan and the baptism of Christ are made the text of a brief dissertation on the Trinity which he strongly maintains, but finally summarizes his own view by saying, "As Angelo was poet, sculptor, painter, and architect, so God had his diversity of manifestations in unity of character:" an illustration, by the way, to which the heretical Sabellius would scarcely object. Happily, however, the doctor does not present it as conclusive, for he very cautiously adds: "No adequate explanation of the trinity is possible."

By following this method, Dr. Mendenhall aptly, and in the main acceptably, discusses most of the leading doctrines of the Christian faith, and of the ethics of which that faith is the only root. Though constantly passing from the topographical to the theological and moral, his transitions are so smoothly made as to appear perfectly natural. He is evidently an independent thinker, having the courage of his opinions, and that, too, on disputed points of theology. To these opinions he gives clear, vigorous expression, with their reasons tersely set forth; yet he is never offensively dogmatic. He writes so vivaciously that the attention of his reader rarely flags. Taken as a whole, the book admirably fulfills his purpose, and may be commended as worthy to be ranked with the best of our numerous popular works on the land which the Christian Church will always regard with peculiar affection because it was the birthplace and abode of the Son of Man.

Kadesh-barnea: Its Importance and Probable Site, with the Story of a Hunt for It, including Studies of the Route of the Exodus and the Southern Boundary of the Holy Land. By H. CLAY TRUMBULL, D.D., Editor of the "Sunday-School Times." 8vo, pp. 478. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1884.

It is an interesting fact, that while the enemies of our faith are searching with unresting toil for facts and arguments with which to impeach its venerable record, the providence of God is, as never before, bringing forth fresh and convincing evidence of the strict accuracy of its statements down even to its topographical descriptions. The noble volume before us, a magnificent specimen of book-making, is a valuable contribution to this end,

albeit it is devoted to only one biblical site, Kadesh-barnea. Concerning this place it discusses: 1. Its Manifold Importance; 2. The Biblical Indications of its Site; 3. The Ancient References to it Outside of the Bible Text; 4. The Later Attempts at its Identifying; 5. The Story of a Hunt for It; 6. Its Sites Compared; 7. A Special Study of the Route of the Exodus.

One's first impression on glancing over this volume is, that its author thoroughly understands his subject. He is master of the literature of the Sinaitic desert. The story of his travels shows that he possesses the spirit, the tact, the persistence of a genuine explorer, and though he sought for Kadesh-barnea under the inspiration of a belief that he should discover it, not where so high an authority as Robinson, with other noted explorers, had located it, but in a spot designated by the Rev. John Rowlands, in 1842, yet he steadfastly reins in his imagination lest it should be captured by that inspiration, until it is confirmed, as he thinks, by the testimony of his senses, and by a careful investigation of the locality and its environments, made in the light of the Mosaic record. Hence it is no imaginary Kadesh-barnea that he describes, but, as he believes, the veritable spot where Israel made his "head-quarters or rallying-point" for some thirty-seven years, and from which he finally marched into the land promised to Abraham.

Kadesh-barnea is a pivotal point in determining the route and abiding places of the Israelites in the Sinaitic desert. Its site determines several others. Hence the importance of certainty as to its location. Robinson fixed it at Ain el-Waybeh, although that site failed to meet all the conditions of the Mosaic narrative. Mr. Rowlands, shortly after the publication of Robinson's "Biblical Researches," accidentally discovered a spot named Ayn Quadees by the Arabs, and perceived that it did fill all the requirements of the Scripture, as to fertility, extent, the rock pouring forth its perennial streams of delicious water, its contiguity to the southern border of Judea, and its lines of approach toward the Holy Land. Many German writers of note favored Rowlands's view. But Robinson, who had never seen Ayn Quadees, condemned it, and his influence won most English and American writers to his side, especially as subsequent travelers failed to find it, owing to various causes explained by Trumbull. In the work before us, this gentleman relates the story of his search for it, and gives his reasons for believing it to be the identical spot of Israel's principal encampment, and his point of

final departure from his forty years' wanderings in the Sinaitic desert. His descriptions and his reasoning upon them appear conclusive; but time and future investigations will put them to the test. We give our readers his graphic picture of Ayn Quadees:

"It was a marvelous sight! Out from the barren and desolate stretch of the burning desert waste, we had come with magical suddenness into an oasis of verdure and beauty, unlooked for and hardly conceivable in such a region. A carpet of grass covered the ground. Fig-trees, laden with fruit nearly ripe enough for eating, were along the shelter of the southern hillside. Shrubs and flowers showed themselves in variety and profusion. Running water gurgled under the waving grass. . . .

"Standing out from the earth-covered limestone hills at the north-eastern sweep of this picturesque recess, was to be seen the large single mass, or small hill of solid rock, which Rowlands looked at as the cliff (*sel'a*) smitten by Moses to cause it to give forth its water when its flowing stream had been exhausted.

"There was a New England look to this oasis especially in the flowers and grass and weeds. . . . Bees were humming there, and birds were flitting from tree to tree. Enormous ant-hills, made of green grass-seeds, instead of sand, were numerous. It was in fact hard to realize that we were in the desert or near it."

As to the extent of this region our author says: "It has a mountain-encircled plain of sufficient extent for the encampment of such a host as Israel's. . . . It is a region where a mighty host could abide many days; and as such a region it stands absolutely alone among all the localities yet discovered on the southern border of Canaan, or near that border."

Among the Holy Hills. By HENRY M. FIELD, D. D., Author of "From the Lakes of Killarney to the Golden Horn," "From Egypt to Japan," and "On the Desert." 12mo, pp. 243. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1884. Price, $1 50.

Dr. Field in this delightful volume tells us what he saw, thought, and felt while traveling in Palestine from Jerusalem to Beyrout. He passed over a track often described, yet never uninteresting to Christian readers when sketched with an intelligent, observing, and picturesque pen, such as this writer wields. Evidently the doctor is not a disciple of the Dryasdust school, since he seems unacquainted with the art of literary dullness. His eye is trained to catch the picturesque in nature, the curious things in

art, and the characteristic features of men. His mind is given to reflections which are natural, suggestive, and useful, abounding in sound sentiments, yet free from sickly sentimentality in expression. His geniality never forsakes him, the discomforts of travel never sour him, the rascalities of guides and dragomen never betray him into fretfulness of soul. The dignified familiarity and friendly spirit of his style puts his readers at their ease, and beguiles them into such pleasant companionship with him that when his journey reaches its close they regret to bid him adieu. Hence, "Among the Holy Hills" will no doubt meet with cordial acceptance from all who love Palestine, not for its soil, climate, archæological treasures, and present inhabitants, but because it is "the cradle of our religion;" and because, "of all that we have, not of religion only, but of liberty also, we must trace back the origin to the Galilean hills."

The Conquest of England. By JOHN RICHARD GREEN, M.A., LL.D., Honorary Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford; Author of "History of the English People," "Short History of the English People," "The Making of England," etc. 8vo, pp. 607. New York: Harper & Brothers.

This last production of Mr. Green's pen was composed in the shadow of death. Yet it bears no marks of weariness or mental decay. It displays the same complete mastery of his subjects, the same sound historic and judicial judgment, conscientiousness, candor, insight into character, descriptive power, and vigorous vivacity of style as the best of his previous works. It relates the stirring events of English history from A. D. 758 to A. D. 1071, ending with the conquest of the Saxons by the Norman knights under the leadership of William I. The story of this period in English history has never been more charmingly and adequately told. It may be a long time before England produces a writer so rarely endowed with genius for historical composition as was this brilliant gentleman.

A Short History of Our Own Times, from the Accession of Queen Victoria to the General Election of 1880. By JUSTIN M'CARTHY, M.P., Author of "A History of Our Own Times." 12mo, pp. 448. New York: Harper & Bros. 1884.

Mr. M'Carthy's reputation as a fascinating writer of history is too generally known to need further praise. His original history has successfully passed the ordeal of criticism on both sides the Atlantic. This abbreviation of it will be read and welcomed by many who are not well able to purchase the larger work. It meets a popular want, and will doubtless be very widely circulated.

Educational.

Christian Educators in Council. Sixty addresses by American educators, with historical notes upon the National Educational Assembly, held at Ocean Grove, N. J., August 9–12, 1883. Also Illiteracy and Education tables from the census of 1880. Compiled and edited by Rev. J. C. HARTZELL, D.D. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1883.

Ocean Grove, a summer city by the "sounding sea," has been made pretty familiar to the American people by its annual religious meetings; but it is becoming more and more a field for all the great reformatory movements of the country. Its convenience of access, its capacity for disposing of a crowd, its great auditorium, and its freedom from all the irregularities produced by alcoholic drinks, give it immense advantages for certain annual meetings and other important gatherings. Hence it was chosen, last year, as the place of meeting for the National Educational Assembly, which, under the organizing ability of Dr. Hartzell, proved to be a great occasion, and for three successive days commanded the attention of an audience consisting of five or six thousand interested hearers. The large book before us, of over two hundred and sixty pages, printed in double column, contains the proceedings of this long intellectual "camp-meeting," together with such other matter pertaining to education as must make Dr. Hartzell's volume a convenient hand-book for all who seek full information on that subject.

The range of discussion embraces all the "problems," and is as wide as the needs of the country. Some idea of its fullness may be gathered from the topics which called forth so many addresses. Among these were, Education as Related to Improvement; The Various Aspects of Illiteracy; National Aid to Common Schools; Education as Related to the Negro; Education as Related to Wealth and Poverty, also to Crime; Education and the Indian; Education and the Mormon; Education in the South; Education and Christianity.

What may perhaps be regarded as the chief point, that which relates to the duty of the national government, received less attention than any other. But the Corresponding Secretary (Rev. C. C. Painter) tells us in his report that there is a great change discernible among the people on that subject, and that public meetings, memorialists, newspapers, and influential individuals are every-where urging Congress to immediate action. It is now nearly forty years since a golden opportunity for governmental

intervention was thrown away. After paying off the national debt an inconvenient surplus accumulated in the Treasury, and there was a strong feeling in the North to have it appropriated to the work of general education. But, unfortunately, the South did not then want public education, and the great sum was distributed to the States and mostly wasted. The case is very different now. Education has become a matter of interest through all the South, and the chief obstruction is a want of adequate means. Hence there is a general willingness apparent in Congress to do something efficient. But the work is delayed by the difficulty of agreeing on a measure which will insure the needful aid without offering a bounty to sharp administrators.

The action of Congress cannot be too prompt. No thoughtful man can fail to see that some system of national education is imperiously demanded. While it is true that there are liberal and efficient systems in many of the States, and that the South will ultimately fall in with the general current and provide for her own people, it is also true that the country cannot afford to wait. Something bold and strong needs to be done at once. The next generation ought to be lifted out of the dark cloud of ignorance that now broods over the land. It is not too much to say that the harmony, the peace, and the good order of the Republic depends upon it.

It appears from the late census (it is in the volume before us) that the number of persons who cannot write is over 4,200,000. People naturally suppose that the great majority of these is among the colored freedmen of the South. But, in spite of their disadvantages, great numbers of them have, in one way or other, picked up a considerable degree of knowledge, so that the lines are now pretty evenly drawn between the colors. As a fact, the negroes are a little ahead, or were when the census was taken, but the white illiterates have not much to boast of. Their number is 2,056,463, while that of the negroes is 2,147-900—only a little in advance. But the nation should not long be required to answer for such a mass of ignorance. It is a perpetual threat of danger, and in large portions of the country it means riots, mobs, and public disorder. But the danger line, as one of the speakers said, "is not Negro education, but the lack of it." Hence we should not lack it long. A very grave duty devolves on Congress. The first interest in a Republic is its citizens. If these are incompetent the State will be incompetent; if these are disorderly the State will be disorderly; and if these are intelli-

gent and self-governed the State will be well and easily governed. But especially is the country bound to care for the freedmen. They have been wrenched from their servitude by a violent *stroke of state*, and their dependence on the government is so great, that they have been universally regarded as its wards. But what kind of a guardian is he who brings up his ward in ignorance and turns him out on the world without any equipment for its most ordinary affairs?

On the subject of the future of the Negro race in America, we have been interested in noting the evident tendency of public thought toward the views of Dr. Stevens, as expressed in his admirable article in the last number of our Quarterly. Some of the speakers, naturally enough, ignore a subject so distasteful, and confine themselves strictly to the matter of education. But others cautiously show what must be the end. Rev. J. W. Hamilton says: "No two races can live side by side in this land, one the reproach of the other. We cannot be confederated. We *must* be assimilated. All the social, intellectual, and constitutional elements in our civilization must mingle in a oneness of relation, inseparable. There can be no distinction of rights, as there must be no restriction of privileges." Rev. Dr. Tanner, editor of the "Christian Recorder," (Philadelphia,) said: "Whether the whites and the blacks of the country shall mix is no longer an open question. It is settled by the fact that the mixture has already, and to a very large extent, taken place. The black man already shares in the best blood of the land."

So the discussion goes on, and meanwhile time is in no hurry, and gives the most abundant opportunity for all the great changes that statesmen see in the future.

Literature and Fiction.

Folk-Lore of Shakespeare. By Rev. T. F. Thistleton Dyer, M.A., Oxon, Author of "British Popular Customs, Past and Present," etc. 8vo, pp. viii, 559. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1884.

Other works on folk-lore in general, and the folk-lore of Shakespeare in particular, have done good service and won excellent reputation, but none of them has been so well adapted to popular use as this production by the Rev. Mr. Dyer. He has made himself familiar with the popular customs of his country, as is evinced by his previous work, as well as by the present one, though the

preparation of the latter required a broader study. For, while Shakespeare makes much use of that purely English folk-lore which sprang from the superstitions, legends, rural tales, and social life of the time of Elizabeth and the two or three centuries preceding, it so happened that into the folk-lore of England in his day there entered the folk-lore of many other lands, which, like many American games, is traceable, not only to various countries of Europe, but to ancient Greece and Rome, and even to the East. In almost all of his dramas, wherever the scene is laid, he shows his rich stock of this kind of knowledge, and employs it with delightful effect. But to thoroughly appreciate it requires an acquaintance with it which most readers of Shakespeare do not possess. A carefully and copiously annotated edition of his plays will lay open for them much of this beauty, but none that we have seen answers the purpose which Mr. Dyer accomplishes. With his explanations he gives such admirable selections from the plays that not a few passages are made to appear in a new light.

Our author groups his subjects in twenty-three classes, two of them entitled "Sundry Superstitions" and "Miscellaneous Customs, etc.," serving for a large number that would fit in nowhere else, and are yet too important to be omitted. And thus he discourses of "fairies," "witches," "ghosts," "demonology and devil-lore," "birds," "animals," etc., with abundant historic information as to use, and tracing each subject to its origin so far as known. In the poet's day, to illustrate, the fairies were both familiar and in fashion, and much of his knowledge of their realm he has put into "A Midsummer-Night's Dream." They are charming little folk, "to whom a cowslip is tall," with Oberon (Auberon in French, and Elberich in German) for their king, and Titania, their queen. As Shakespeare is the first to give her this name, it would seem that he identifies the fairies with the classic attendants of Diana whom Ovid calls Titania. She is the mischievous Queen Mab "that plats the manes of horses in the night." Puck, the prankish jester of the crowd, "which most men call hob-goblin"—"hob" being the diminutive of Robert and Robin—is Robert the Goblin, that is, Robin Goodfellow, who misleads night wanderers, and then laughs at them, and, again, will "grind corn for a mess of milk, cut wood, or do any manner of drudgery work." Popular fairy characteristics were beauty, power, perpetual youth, immortality, ability to assume various forms and to become invisible at will, love of music and dancing, pinching slovens and sluts till they were black and blue, hating

the wicked, and protecting and enriching the good. Shakespeare might thus be called the poet of fairydom.

Mr. Dyer brings together in a chapter of thirty-two pages the principal proverbs either quoted or alluded to by Shakespeare. Some of them are identical with proverbs in use on the continent, and some are of Latin origin, while others are plainly of English birth, as, for instance, "Make hay while the sun shines," which Mr. Dyer is very sure could have originated only under such variable skies as those of England. Many of these have been perpetuated by Shakespeare, and are in current use in this as well as in the mother country. Equally curious and interesting would be a list of the pithy sayings originating with the poet himself which have come into use as proverbs since his day. This, however, did not fall into our author's plan.

Who's to Blame? By HENRY FAUNTLEROY. 16mo, pp. 355. Nashville, Tenn.: Southern Methodist Publishing House. Printed for the Author. 1883.

The author of this volume writes under the inspiration of intense antagonism to that prevailing epidemic of financial corruption which was begotten by the necessary expenditure of vast sums of money during the War of the Rebellion. It is inevitable, human nature being what it is, that such prodigality as war compels, associated as it always must be with a vastly inflated currency, will create a passion in many minds for the rapid accumulation of wealth. That passion blinds and paralyzes the moral sense, and men learn to transact business, not in the spirit of the second great commandment, but under the impulses of that supreme selfishness which is utterly reckless of moral obligations and consequences. Out of these base impulses come the adulteration of food, fraud in manufactured articles, lying misrepresentations, grinding of *employés*, financial trickeries, gambling, speculations of various kinds, breaches of trust, defalcations, bribery, collusions between lawyers and judges, the corruption of legislators, and a multitude of kindred deeds degrading to their perpetrators, operating mischievously on society, and, if permitted to continue indefinitely, breeding confusion, distress, and serious disturbances in the nation.

Mr. Fauntleroy, profoundly impressed, apparently, by the extensive prevalence of these Protean forms of corruption, seeks to illustrate their operations and effects in a story which, though it cannot be accorded very high literary rank, does, nevertheless,

produce a deep impression on its reader. It brings before him a young man of moral stamina sufficient, under ordinary circumstances, to keep him honest, but not tough enough to resist extraordinary temptations presented in moments of extreme trial. He places this man in a business house whose head, though a member of a Christian Church, and actively engaged in Christian work, conducts his extensive business on methods requiring misrepresentations on the part of his poorly paid clerks. Our author's hero refuses to lie and is discharged. Unable to find other employment, he and his delicate wife are reduced to extreme want. One of his old employer's men, already corrupted by his enforced habit of lying for the benefit of the business, meets him in the crisis of his troubles, persuades him to rob the store, and then betrays his intention to the firm. He is consequently shot on entering the store, and subsequently tried for burglary. Nothing saves him from the state-prison but the sympathy of an upright lawyer, who, having learned the facts in the case, so exposes the immoral conduct of the firm that the jury spontaneously acquits him. The details of this part of the story are sensationally wrought out; but they move the reader's heart to indignation against those who were chiefly to blame for the wrong, to hatred of their unprincipled methods of business, and to sympathy with *employés*, to whom such men virtually say, "You must tell lies for our benefit or starve."

One is loath to believe that there are many business houses in the land such as this book so mercilessly exposes. Neither can one very willingly admit that there are many such tricky lawyers and unprincipled judges as it describes. Yet the citations from several highly respectable metropolitan journals, found in its appendix, indicate that at least in some States there are some such. One of these journals affirms that "courts have become 'shops' where law, judgments, and final processes are turned out to applicants according to the expenditure that is made. This does not imply that the judges sell their judgments, but it does imply that the system is so framed and administered that, "by the expenditure of money, justice may be delayed and defeated, and irreparable wrong committed." Conceding that these statements are justified by far too many facts, constantly transpiring even in this State, they forecast an evil future. Viewed in connection with the unprincipled methods of greedy millionaires, gigantic railroad and other corporations, and with the organization of labor to resist the encroachments of capital, they portend

social and political storms before which much of the wealth so wrongfully acquired will be swept into bottomless abysses. Every social wrong has its Nemesis, as all history demonstrates. The reign of injustice is sure to be succeeded by the reign of terror, unless the latter is averted by timely repentance. Hence the need of the hour is a wide-spread ethical reform in law, in business, and in political life. And since this can only be brought about by spiritual and divine forces, it behooves the Church of God to elevate and enforce the ethics of her life within her own pale, and then to go forth in the spirit of her Lord and regenerate the life of the nation. The volume under notice, despite its lack of superior literary merit, especially in its conversations, which in places have a savor of sentimental cant, may contribute somewhat to this end. For this reason, it is commended to such readers as prefer learning truth through fiction to its graver but more profitable study in didactic essays.

Miscellaneous.

The Gospel according to St. Mark. With Introduction, Notes, and Maps. By THOMAS M. LINDSAY, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Church History, Free Church College, Glasgow. 12mo, pp. 272. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford.

This is one of a series of hand-books for Bible classes and private students now in course of publication in Edinburgh, under the supervision of Drs. Dods and Whyte. Its notes are brief, yet without obscurity; based on an intelligent exegesis, though not critical in form, and well adapted to the needs of the classes for whose use it was designed.

Christianity and Humanity. A Course of Lectures delivered in Meiji, Kuaido, Tokio, Japan. By CHARLES S. EBY, B.A. Including one lecture each by Prof. J. A. EWING, B.Sc., F.R.S.E., of the Science Department, Tokio University, and Prof. J. M. DIXON, M.A., of the Imperial College of Engineering. 8vo, pp. 296. Tokio, Yokohama: R. Meiklejohn & Co. 1883. [All rights reserved.]

These Lectures are a curious exhibition of the fact that the discussions awakened and prosecuted here in our Anglo-Saxondom are agitated in Japan with the same earnestness, a country so recently absolutely closed to all Western approaches. These Lectures were delivered in English, and on a subsequent evening repeated in Japanese. Spencerism, Darwinism, Antiquity of Man, etc., are discussed in free, clear, popular, and effective style.

They would be found very readable, and do much good, if republished in America.

HARPER'S FRANKLIN SQUARE LIBRARY: *More Leaves from the Journal of a Life in the Highlands from* 1862 *to* 1882. 8vo, pp. 42. *A Short History of Our Own Times from the Accession of Queen Victoria to the General Election of* 1880. By JUSTIN M'CARTHY. 8vo, pp. 89. *Red Riding Hood.* A Novel. By FANNY E. MILLETT NOTTEY. 8vo, pp. 84.

Light to the Path. A Compend of Bible Teachings concerning God and the Creation, Fall, and Restoration of Man. By JOSEPH LONGKING. 32mo, pp. 126. New York: Phillips and Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe.

Sound in doctrine, concise, clear, forcible in statement, this little book is exceedingly valuable for the religious instruction of youth in the family, and as a text-book for catechumen classes. It is a body of divinity compressed into a nutshell.

HOME COLLEGE SERIES: Tracts with Covers. Phillips & Hunt. No. 78. *Art in Greece.* No. 74. *Hugh Miller.* No. 87. *Charles Lamb.* No. 89. *The Regicides.* No. 90. *Sketch of Amos Lawrence.* No. 91. *John Knox.* No. 92. *Margaret Fuller.* No. 93. *The Life-Current.* No. 94. *Charlotte Brontë.*

This series of tracts, numbering 100, is an admirable conception of Dr. Vincent's, designed to create a taste for literature in such as have not been favored with literary training in early life.

Luther: A Short Biography. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, A. M., Honorary Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Reprinted from the "Contemporary Review." 16mo, pp. 90. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1884.

Mr. Froude evidently wrote this epitome of Luther's career *con amore.* It is, as usual with this writer, graphic in its descriptions, clear and forcible in statement, and thoroughly sympathetic with the heroism, if not with the beliefs, of its subject, of whom, in his closing sentence, he says: "A living belief can rise only out of a believing human soul, and that any faith, any piety, is now alive in Europe, even in the Roman Church itself, whose insolent hypocrisy he humbled into shame, is due in large measure to the poor miner's son who was born in a Saxon village four hundred years ago."

A Commentary on the Shorter Catechism. By Rev. ALEXANDER WHYTE, D. D., Minister of St. George's Free Church, Edinburgh. 12mo, pp. 213. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford.

While some Scottish theologians are striving to create a new departure in theology, others are equally strenuous in their endeavors to revive the declining influence of the dogmas of Augustine and Calvin. Hence this commentary, or *catena* rather, in which much skill and considerable learning are employed in giving interpretations to Scripture, many of which, we opine, neither Christ nor Paul could indorse.

A Day in Athens with Socrates. Translations from the Protagoras and the Republic of Plato. New York: C. Scribner & Sons. 16mo, pp. 145.

It was a happy thought which moved the translator of this delightful volume to bring some of the thoughts of Plato, the greatest and best of the ancient thinkers, within the purview of men unacquainted with Greek. Written in pure idiomatic English, yet faithfully rendering the original, it cannot fail to be an aid to the culture of the popular mind.

Wesley's Designated Successor. The Life, Letters, and Literary Labors of the Rev. John William Fletcher, Vicar of Madeley, Shropshire. By Rev. L. TYERMAN, Author of the "Life and Times of the Rev. Samuel Wesley, M.A., Rector of Epworth," "The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A.," "The Life of the Rev. George Whitefield, B.A.," and "The Oxford Methodists." 8vo, pp. 581. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1883.

The name of John Fletcher is a household word wherever Methodism is known. For his portrait in our present number we are indebted to Mr. Tyerman's recently published Life of this saintly man, entitled "Wesley's Designated Successor." It is "taken from an exceedingly scarce engraving in the Methodist Museum at Centenary Hall, London."

Mr. Tyerman, in his modest preface, says that this volume contains "all the facts of any importance that are known concerning Fletcher, and that here, more than in any previous publication, is illustrated the intellectual and saintly character of one of the holiest men that ever lived."

The appearance of this volume is timely, since its wide circulation would be an antidote to that spirit of worldliness which is tempting the Church to be content with a lower type of the Christian life than was illustrated in Fletcher's experience, and which is taught by Christ when he says to his disciples, "Abide in me, and I in you."



REV^D DR CURRY.

EDITOR FOR THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH U.S.

Engraved from a DAGUERREAN PHOTOGRAPH

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1884.

I.—THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH.

[FIRST ARTICLE.]

the Pentateuch, but especially the Book of Genesis, is of posite origin, and embodies a variety of ancient documents, ions to every critical student. Ancient as well as mod- aders observed in the "Book of the Law of Moses" pas- s which could not well have been written by the great law- himself. The tradition of some revision or reproduc- by the hand of Ezra is almost as uniform as that of the sole authorship. It appears in the apocryphal 2 Esdras,* in the Clementine Homilies,† and in many of the Chris- Fathers.‡ Aben Ezra in the twelfth century, and Carl- and Masius in the sixteenth, maintained that the so-called s of Moses "were not composed by him in their present , but by Ezra or some other inspired man, who substituted names of places for old and obsolete ones by which the ory of events could be best apprehended and understood." In the seventeenth century we find Hobbes arguing that we "cannot suppose these writings to have been composed by Moses, because they are commonly called Books of Moses,

xiv. 19–48. † Homily ii., [illegible] 37

Clement of Alex., *Strom.* 22; Tertullian, *De [illegible] Foem.*, iii; *Hær.* iii. 21; Chrysostom, *Hom.* viii *in Ep. Heb.*; Theodoret, *Pref.* Paul; *Ep. ad. Chilonem*; Jerome, *Adv. Helvid.*

Commentary on Joshua, at chap. x.x, 47.

METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1884.

ART. I.—THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH.

[FIRST ARTICLE.]

THAT the Pentateuch, but especially the Book of Genesis, is of composite origin, and embodies a variety of ancient documents, is obvious to every critical student. Ancient as well as modern readers observed in the "Book of the Law of Moses" passages which could not well have been written by the great lawgiver himself. The tradition of some revision or reproduction by the hand of Ezra is almost as uniform as that of the Mosaic authorship. It appears in the apocryphal Revelation of Ezra,* in the Clementine Homilies,† and in many of the Christian Fathers.‡ Aben Ezra in the twelfth century, and Carlstadt and Masius in the sixteenth, maintained that the so-called Books of Moses "were not composed by him in their present form, but by Ezra or some other inspired man, who substituted new names of places for old and obsolete ones, by which the memory of events could be best apprehended and preserved."§ In the seventeenth century we find Hobbes arguing that we should no more suppose these writings to have been composed by Moses, because they are commonly called Books of Moses,

* 2 Esdras, xiv, 19–48.

† Homily iii, chap. 47.

‡ Namely, Clement of Alex., *Strom.* 22; Tertullian, *De Cult. Fœm.*, iii; Irenæus, *Adv. Haer.* iii, 21; Chrysostom, *Hom.* viii, *in Ep. Heb.*; Theodoret, *Pref. in Psalmos*; Basil, *Ep. ad. Chilonem*; Jerome, *Adv. Helvid.*

§ Masius, Commentary on Joshua, at chap. xix, 47.

than we should believe the Books of Joshua, Ruth, and Samuel to have been written by the individuals whose names they bear, "for in titles of books the subject is marked as often as the writer." * Similar views were advanced by Isaac Peyrère, a French Protestant, who went over to Romanism, and also by Spinoza, who held that all the books from Genesis to Kings form one great historical work, composed of many documents of diverse authorship, not always in harmony with each other, but arranged and edited in their present form after the Babylonian exile, and probably by Ezra.† In the year 1678, Richard Simon's Critical History of the Old Testament appeared, and gave a new turn to Pentateuchal criticism by calling attention to the varieties of composition and style apparent even in closely connected narratives, (as in the account of the flood, especially in Gen. vii, 17–24.) Simon's work was sharply criticised by Le Clerc,‡ who, however, put forth the singular theory that the Pentateuch, though containing documents both older and later than Moses, was probably compiled by the exiled priest whom the king of Assyria sent to instruct the Samaritan colonists. 2 Kings xvii, 27. These various criticisms made little impression at the time of their appearance, but they opened the way for the more thorough study of the Pentateuch, which began about the middle of the eighteenth century, and continues with growing interest at the present hour. Modern criticism, so far as it has opposed the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, or attempted to explain its origin, exhibits a series of theories; and no intelligent discussion of the latest phases of Old Testament criticism is possible without some acquaintance with the history of these successive theories.

* Leviathan, part iii, chap. 33. English Works, vol. iii, pp. 369. Ed. Molesworth, Lond., 1839.

† This editor, he observes, "called the first five books after the name of Moses, because his life is the principal subject. For the same reason the sixth book is named Joshua, the seventh Judges," etc. Spinoza, *Opera*, vol. i, pp. 491. Ed. Van Vloten et Land, 1882.

‡ In an anonymous publication, entitled "Sentimens de quelques theologiens de Holland sur l'Histoire Critique du V. T." Amsterdam, 1685. Le Clerc soon after abandoned this theory, and in his Commentary on Genesis, first issued in 1693, maintained that passages of manifestly later date than the age of Moses were additions by a later editor. About the same time, Van Dale, a friend of Le Clerc, in a work on the Origin and Progress of Idolatry, advanced the theory that Ezra compiled the Pentateuch from a book of Mosaic laws and various historical and prophetical writings.

Theory of Documents.

Biblical scholars like Vitringa and Calmet, who believed in the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, admitted that the great lawgiver made free use of ancient traditions, genealogies, and annals of the patriarchs, arranging, revising, and supplementing them to suit his purpose. But the first attempt to indicate the number and distinctive character of these documents was made by Jean Astruc, professor of medicine in the College of France, who published at Brussels and Paris, in 1753, a work entitled "Conjectures upon the Original Memoirs which Moses appears to have used in Composing the Book of Genesis." This writer detected a noticeable use of the divine names Elohim and Jehovah, by means of which different chapters and sections of Genesis were distinguishable, and he conjectured that Moses had for the most part made use of two original memoirs, each of which was still traceable by the occurrence of one or the other of these names. He also held that, besides these principal sources, some nine or ten other documents might still be traced by the notable absence of any divine name, or by the use of another name than Elohim or Jehovah, (for example, Gen. xix, 30–38, xxii, 20–24, xxv, 12–18.) Astruc supposed that these different documents were at first arranged by Moses in separate columns, but were afterward copied in one continuous narrative, by which process some of them came to be misplaced.

Astruc's views do not appear to have commanded much attention until about 1762, when J. F. W. Jerusalem gave them a favorable notice in his Letters on the Mosaic Writings, and soon afterward Eichhorn, profiting by the work of all his predecessors in this field of criticism, gave them great notoriety, and presented them in more complete and scholarly form, first in his Repertorium for Biblical and Oriental Literature, (1779,) and subsequently in the successive editions of his Introduction to the Old Testament, (1780–1823.) Eichhorn's brilliant essays in this department of biblical study opened the way for a host of similar attempts to ascertain the age and authorship of the constituent parts of the Pentateuch. John G. Hasse maintained that it was compiled at the time of the Babylonian exile, from writings which belonged in part to Moses, but

which had become greatly enlarged and altered by later hands.* F. C. Fulda also argued that portions of the Pentateuch are of Mosaic authorship, such as the decalogue, most of the songs contained in the last four books, and the list of encampments in Numbers xxxiii. He supposed that a collection of laws was made in the time of David, but that our Pentateuch in its present form was composed by some unknown redactor after the exile.† Similar views were put forward by H. Corrodi,‡ G. L. Bauer,§ and K. D. Ilgen.‖ This last named writer attempted a more minute analysis of Genesis than that of Eichhorn, and maintained the theory of a second Elohist. Eichhorn himself modified some of his earlier views in the fourth edition of his *Einleitung* (1824.)

Theory of Fragments.

Near the close of the last and in the earlier part of the present century, several rationalistic critics endeavored to show that the Pentateuch was of a more fragmentary character than the current theory of documents allowed. Some of the advocates of that hypothesis, however, had given utterance to opinions which led very naturally to the conclusion that these books were but a loose compilation of heterogeneous fragments. This theory was formerly advanced by Alexander Geddes, a Roman Catholic divine, in his annotated new translation of the Bible, the first volume of which appeared in London in 1792. He held that the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua were compiled by the same author, and consisted of a great variety of composite elements, some coeval with Moses, some older and some later, and some of them probably oral traditions. He argued that it could not have been written before the time of David, nor after that of Hezekiah, and probably belonged to

* Aussichten zu künftigen Aufklärungen über das A. T., Jena, 1785. This writer afterwards changed his opinion, and held that the five books were as a whole the work of Moses, but had received at various times numerous glosses and supplements until Ezra finally revised them and gave them their present form. Entdeckungen, Halle, 1805.

† Paulus's Neuen Repertorium für bib. und morgenl. Literatur, iii, p. 180. 1791.

‡ Versuch einer Beleuchtung der Geschichte des jüdischen und christlichen Bibelkanons. Halle, 1792.

§ Entwurf einer Einleitung in das A. T. 1794.

‖ Urkunde des jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs in ihrer Urgestalt. Halle, 1798.

the period of Solomon's long and peaceful reign. J. G. Nachtigal (under the name of Otmar) published a similar view in Henke's Magazin für Religionsphilosophie, Exegese und Kirchengeschichte, and at first (volume ii, 1794) maintained that much of the Pentateuch may have originated with Moses, and all of it may have been collected and arranged in its present form before the division of the kingdom; but the next year (vol. iv, 1795) he attributed to Moses little else than the decalogue, the list of encampments in the desert, a few genealogical tables, and a few songs. He aimed to show that, besides some documents of that kind, there were probably very few, if any, literary monuments among the Hebrews before the time of Samuel, but that in the schools of the prophets and among wise men numerous histories and songs were composed. These were afterward collected into books, and thus originated the so-called Books of Moses, which were brought to their present form about the time of the Babylonian exile, and perhaps under the supervision of Jeremiah. Substantially the same hypothesis was advocated in Vater's Commentary on the Pentateuch, (3 parts, Halle, 1802–5.) This writer argued, from the non-observance of many important Mosaic laws, that they could not have been in existence before the reign of David or Solomon. A. T. Hartmann subsequently repeated these arguments, and maintained that the art of writing was unknown among the Israelites until the age of the Judges, and was not used in the composition of books until Samuel's time.* Von Böhlen took the position that Deuteronomy is the oldest portion of the Pentateuch, and first appeared in the time of Josiah. The other books were subsequently added, but the entire work could not have been completed until after the exile.† In substantial accord with Von Böhlen were the conclusions of W. Vatke,‡ and J. F. L. George; § but these last two writers anticipated in some important points the theory of the gradual development of the religion of Israel, which has become so prominent in recent critical

* Hist.-krit. Forschungen über die Bildung, das Zeitalter und den Plan der fünf Bücher Moses. Rostock, 1831.

† Die Genesis hist.-krit. erläutert. Königsb., 1835.

‡ Biblische Theologie. Berlin, 1835.

§ Die älteren jüdischen Feste, mit einer Kritik der Gesetzgebung des Pentateuchs. Berlin, 1835.

discussions. De Wette also for a long time held to the theory of fragments, but his work may be better treated in another connection.

Theory of Supplements.

The Fragment-Hypothesis soon became unsatisfactory to some of its ablest advocates. It was mainly held by extreme rationalists, who treated the Mosaic narratives as altogether mythical or legendary. But the unity of the Pentateuch was too apparent, and the evidences of plan and purpose running through the whole were too many for the most arbitrary critics to set aside. One of Ewald's earliest publications contributed largely to establishing the unity of the Book of Genesis.* The way for what is commonly known as the Hypothesis of Supplements was prepared by such writers as Bertholdt, Herbst, and Volney, men not readily classed with any special school, but who maintained that the Pentateuch was in great part the work of Moses, but much revised and supplemented by later hands. According to Bertholdt, the work was brought to its present form sometime between the beginning of Saul's and the end of Solomon's reign.† According to Herbst, the final redaction was probably made, after Ezra's time, by the college of Elders.‡ Volney allowed less to Moses, and supposed that the Pentateuch in its present form was the product of the combined labors of Hilkiah, Shaphan, Achbor, (2 Kings xxii, 8–12,) and other scribes and prophets of the age of Josiah. §

De Wette made use of all the suggestions of his predecessors, and in his earlier publications on this subject adopted in the main the Hypothesis of Fragments. Many single fragments of the Pentateuch could not, in his opinion, have originated earlier than the times of David. The different narratives were written independently of one another, and afterward put together by different collectors. The compilation of Leviticus was probably by another hand, and certainly later than that of Exodus. Numbers was a supplement to the earlier collections,

* Die Komposition der Genesis kritische untersucht. 1823.

† Hist.-krit. Einleitung, Theil iii. 1813.

‡ Observationes de Pent. 4 librorum posteriorum auctore et editore, 1817. In his Introduction, however, edited and published after his death, (1840–44,) the redaction is placed in the time of David.

§ Recherches nouvelles sur l'Histoire Ancienne. 1814.

and Deuteronomy was composed in the time of Josiah.* He subsequently modified his views, and in the fifth and sixth editions of his Introduction to the Old Testament (1840, 1845) he maintained that the Pentateuch and Joshua bore evidences of a threefold redaction, showing traces, first, of the Elohist, second, of the Jehovist, and third, of the Deuteronomist. The earliest of these must have lived after the Israelites were ruled by kings, and the latest belonged to the time of Josiah. He also allowed that among the sources employed by the first redactor were many ancient and genuine monuments of the Mosaic age.

The views of Friedrich Bleek were, like those of De Wette, gradually developed. As early as 1822 he maintained † that there are many parts of the Pentateuch which cannot be later than the age of Moses, and nothing which requires us to believe that the last revision was made as late as the time of the Babylonian exile. His more mature views appear in his Lectures on Old Testament Introduction,‡ according to which the most ancient and original documents now contained in the Pentateuch and Joshua were worked up into one continuous narrative by a first writer, commonly called the Elohist. This was the *Grundschrift*, or fundamental writing, and contained an account of the creation, the flood, and the lives of Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, and Joshua, and was probably composed in the time of Saul. It embraced documents older than the time of Moses, and a large portion of the laws which were enacted by Moses himself. The writer employed the name Elohim until he came to the narrative of Moses's life, after which the name of Jehovah appears. This fundamental history was made the basis of a larger work, namely, that of the Jehovist, who lived in the time of David, and supplemented the Elohistic writing with numerous additions. This Jehovist produced the first four books of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua in substantially the form in which

* Dissertatio qua Deut. a prioribus Pent. libris diversum alius cujusdam recentioris auctoris opus esse demonstratur. Jena, 1805. De Wette set forth essentially the same views in the first edition of his Beiträge zur Einleitung ins A. T. 1806–7.

† In Rosenmüller's Bib. exeget. Repertorium. Leipzig.

‡ Edited and published after his death by J. Bleek and A. Kamphausen. Berlin, 1860. English translation by Venables, London, 1875.

we find them now, (excepting particularly Lev. xxvi, 3–45.) The final redaction was made by the author of Deuteronomy sometime during the reign of Manasseh.

This Theory of Supplements received the support of J. J. Stähelin,* who, however, would not allow that any part of our Pentateuch was composed by Moses. He held it to be a work of Samuel, or of one of his scholars, based upon an older history which extended from the creation of the world to the conquest of Canaan, and contained a large part of Genesis, nearly all the three middle books of the Pentateuch, and the geographical portions of the Book of Joshua. Friedrich Tuch also adopted this theory, but supposed the Elohist to have written in the time of Saul, and the Jehovist in the time of Solomon.† Ewald is noted for propounding an analysis of the Pentateuch and Joshua so minute as to detect therein the work of eight different writers, whose several parts, with the dates of composition, his critical instinct assumed to determine with remarkable nicety. He recognized a fundamental Elohistic document, which extended from the creation to the time of Solomon, and embraced three older writings, namely, the Book of Jehovah's Wars, a life of Moses, and the Book of the Covenants. This ancient history he named the Great Book of Origins, and attributed it to a contemporary of Solomon.‡ To this work subsequent writers made numerous additions, and the Hexateuch received its present form from the Deuteronomist, who wrote in Egypt during the latter part of Manasseh's reign.§ Cæsar Von Lengerke also placed the composition of the

* First in his Kritische Untersuchungen über die Genesis, (Basel, 1830,) then in the Studien und Kritiken for 1835, and more fully in his Kritische Untersuchungen über den Pentateuch, die Bücher Josua, Richter, Samuel's und der Könige. Berlin, 1843.

† Kommentar über die Genesis. Halle, 1838.

‡ For this writer Ewald confesses the highest admiration: "Lofty spirit! Thou whose work has for centuries not irrationally had the fortune of being taken for that of thy great hero Moses himself, I know not thy name, and divine only from thy vestiges when thou didst live, and what thou didst achieve; but if these thy traces incontrovertibly forbid me to identify thee with him who was greater than thou, and whom thou thyself only desiredst to magnify according to his deserts, then see that there is no guile in me, nor any pleasure in knowing thee not absolutely as thou wert!" History of Israel, English translation, vol. i, p. 96.

§ Geschichte des Volkes Israel, vol. i, first issued in 1843. English translation by Martineau, London, 1869.

Elohistic document in the time of Solomon, and supposed it to have been enlarged by the Jehovist in the time of Hezekiah, and further worked over and supplemented by the Deuteronomist, who brought it to its present form (excepting, perhaps, Deut. xxxiii) during the reign of Josiah.* Vaihinger makes the three different writers to be a Pre-Elohist, (of whose work only a few fragments remain,) the Elohist, and the Jehovist.† Hupfeld made out four writers, the Elohist, a second Elohist, a Jehovist, and a Redactor, who gave the entire work its final unity and finish.‡ Böhmer adopted Hupfeld's theory in the main, but attempted to ascertain more definitely the extent of the Redactor's work.§ Riehm labored to show that Deuteronomy is a literary fiction, but in no way a dishonest or blameworthy performance; from the mention of ships in chap. xxviii, 68, he concluded that it was written in the time of Manasseh.‖ Knobel produced one of the most minute and elaborate works on the Pentateuch extant, and distributed its several component parts among five different writers, namely, the authors of the fundamental document, (Grundschrift,) the Book of the Upright, (Rechtsbuch,) and the War-book, (Kriegsbuch,) the Jehovist, and the Deuteronomist. The first of these lived probably in the time of Saul, the last under Josiah.¶ Nöldeke apportioned the work among at least four writers, the Elohist, the Jehovist, a Redactor, and the Deuteronomist, the first of whom was a priest living at Jerusalem in the time of David or Solomon, the last in the reign of Josiah.**

Other writers, less distinguished, contributed to the elaboration of this Theory of Supplements, each one producing some new discovery touching the relationship of the different parts of the Pentateuch. Among the more recent and thorough

* Kenaan, Volks-und Religions-Geschichte Israels bis zum Tode des Josua. Königsb., 1844.

† Herzog's Real-Encyclopädie, art. Pentateuch. Stuttgardt, 1856.

‡ Die Quellen der Genesis. Berlin, 1853.

§ Liber Genesis Pentateuchicus. 1860. Davidson's views correspond substantially with those of Hupfeld and Böhmer. Introduction to the Old Testament, vol. i, 1862.

‖ Gesetzgebung Mosis im Lande Moab. Gotha, 1854.

¶ Kritik des Pent. und Josua, at the end of his commentary on these books in the Kurzgefasstes exegetiches Handbuch zum A. T. Leipzig, 1861.

** Untersuchungen zur Kritik des A. T. Kiel, 1869

discussions of this hypothesis is that of Schrader, as given in the eighth edition of De Wette's *Einleitung*, (Berlin, 1869.) He supposes four successive writers, and points out their characteristic differences of language, style, and religious conceptions. The first he calls the Annalist, who belonged to the earlier part of David's reign; the second wrote soon after the division of the kingdom, and is named the Theocratic Narrator. These two writers composed separate and independent works, which were combined a generation later and supplemented by a third writer, who is called the Prophetic Narrator. The final redactor of the Pentateuch was the Deuteronomist, who composed his book and revised the whole before the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign.

Delitzsch and Kurtz, while holding to the Mosaic origin of the main parts of the Pentateuch, adopt the essential elements of the supplementary hypothesis. In the Introduction of his Commentary on Genesis Delitzsch makes Exod. xix–xxiv the kernel of the Pentateuch, and supposes it to have been written by Moses. The other laws were given orally by Moses and written down by the priests. Deuteronomy must be accepted as in substance the work of Moses. After the conquest and occupation of Canaan, some man like Eleazar (Num. xxvi, 1; xxxi, 21) compiled the main (Elohistic) work, incorporating in it the roll of the covenant, and, perhaps, the last words of Moses. This was supplemented by Joshua (Deut. xxxii, 44; Josh. xxiv, 26) or one of the elders, (Num. xi, 25,) who added Deuteronomy in its present form, and the Jehovistic sections. *

* Commentar über die Genesis, p. 31. Leipzig, 1872. Much has been said of the recent change in Delitzsch's views, which appear in a series of twelve articles in Luthardt's Zeitschrift fur kirchliche Wissenschaft for 1880. He now admits the use of parallel documents running through much of the Pentateuch, the priority of the Jehovistic portions, and that Deuteronomy comes between the two. Excepting the priority of the Jehovist these latter views are not materially different from those advanced in his Commentary on Genesis. He still maintains the Mosaic origin of much of the Pentateuch, but concedes that many of the laws originated with the needs of the people at a later day, and maintains that the legislation begun by Moses was doubtless continued by the priests, to which such matters were intrusted after Moses's death. He believes that Deuteronomy is in substance Mosaic, but in form has been modified by the subjectivity and style of the writer, (the Deuteronomiker,) who nevertheless was in fullest spiritual accord with Moses, and has reproduced his last traditional discourses in an authentic form. He rejects the main positions of the theories of the school of Wellhausen, and strenuously opposes the notion that Deuteronomy originated at

According to Kurtz, the Pentateuch is of Mosaic origin in that it was, in the main, prepared under Moses's direct supervision, and completed by his assistants and contemporaries. Probably Moses himself composed with his own hand only those portions which are expressly attributed to him. In the historical parts he admits two distinct sources, a fundamental and a supplementary writing. The last revision of the entire work as we possess it was probably made near the close of Joshua's life, or, perhaps, soon after his death.*

Theory of Ethnic Development.

We thus designate the latest phase of Old Testament criticism, which is particularly noted for the stress it lays upon the national religious development of the Israelitish people, and the dates and order of what it affirms to be distinct and successive legal codes. We have noticed above that Von Böhlen, Vatke, and George, as early as 1835, maintained that Deuteronomy is the oldest book of the Pentateuch. But the monograph of K. H. Graf on the Historical Books of the Old Testament (Leipzig, 1866) marked an epoch in the criticism of the Pentateuch. This writer was a pupil of Prof. Edward Reuss, who had long previously argued for the priority of Deuteronomy, but whose more fully developed views were published at a later date. Graf's theory supposes an ancient Elohistic work which has been subjected to three great revisions and enlargements. The first was done by the Jehovist in the time of the earlier kings, and contained the legislation recorded in Exod. xiii, xx–xxiii, and xxxiv. The second was made by the Deuteronomist, who was the author of the book found by Hilkiah. 2 Kings xxii, 8. This book is supposed to have been that portion of our Deuteronomy which extends from chap. iv, 45, to chap. xxix, 1, excepting chap. xxvii. Its author made free use of the older work of the Jehovist, and afterward combined that work with his own and added Deut. i–iv, 44, as a new preface. The third revision was made during and after the Babylonian exile, and is notable for having added, in the body of the work,

the time of Josiah. He admits that Ezra may have participated in the codification of the Mosaic laws, but he stoutly controverts the idea that the Levitical legislation was a post-exilian fiction.

* History of the Old Covenant, English translation, vol. iii, p. 502 ff.

the Levitical legislation, which now appears in Exod. xii, xxv–xxxi, xxxv–xl, most of Leviticus, and the greater part of Numbers. These Levitical laws are held to exhibit numerous evidences of a later origin and a more elaborate ritual than those of Deuteronomy.*

This theory of the origin of the law-books of Israel was taken up and presented in a still more radical form by A. Kuenen, first in his Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin of the Books of the Old Testament, (Leyden, 1861–65,) and later in his Religion of Israel, (1869–70,) his Five Books of Moses, (1872,) and his Prophets and Prophecy in Israel, (1875.)† According to Kuenen, the religion of Israel is nothing more nor less, than one of the principal religions of the world, and must be explained in its genesis and development like all other religions. The Israelites in Egypt were probably polytheists; by and by they came to consider their national deity as distinct from other gods, and called him El Shaddai; afterward they were taught by Moses, who gave them the decalogue, to call this god Jehovah. The stories of the patriarchs are ancient myths, and have been wrought over by various writers. The first written documents of note are those of the prophets of the eighth century before Christ, such as Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, and the historical books of the Kings. Under the ministry of the prophets the worship of Jehovah became purer, and during the reign of Hezekiah the Book of Deuteronomy was written and made to serve the purpose described in 2 Kings xxii and xxiii. A programme of national worship was outlined by Ezekiel, and became the basis of the subsequent Levitical legislation, which first came into use after the return from exile, and was formulated by Ezra. This distinguished scribe compiled the voluminous Book of the Law in the shape in which we now possess it.

This theory, strange as it may seem, has captivated many modern critics, and is maintained in substance by Kalisch in

* Die geschichtliche Bucher des A. T. Leipzig, 1866. Graf subsequently so far modified his theory as to make the work of the Jehovist the original kernel of the Pentateuch, and to place the Elohist after the Levitical legislation, about B. C. 450. Grundschrift des Pentateuchs, in Merx's Archiv., 1869.

† This work on the Prophets has been translated into English by Milroy, (London, 1877,) and that on the Religion of Israel by May. 3 volumes. London, 1874.

his Commentary on Leviticus,* by Aug. Kayser,† by Bishop Colenso,‡ and by Smend in his recent Commentary on Ezekiel. § But among all its advocates the most famous at the present time are probably Profs. Wellhausen and Reuss in Germany, and W. Robertson Smith in Scotland. According to Wellhausen, the Pentateuch is composed of three separate and independent works, which were wrought over, and, with additions from other sources, fashioned into one connected whole by Ezra or one of his contemporaries. The oldest document is the work of the Jehovist, compiled from previously existing Jehovistic and Elohistic records, and therefore by this critic designated by the letters J. E. This ancient composition was mainly historical, but contained the laws of Exod. xx–xxv. The second in order of the great documents was Deuteronomy, composed in the reign of Josiah, (designated D.) The third, called the Priest-Codex, (P. C.,) contained the laws of Exod. xxvi–xl, Leviticus, and Numbers i–x, and was accompanied by a historical introduction reflecting the spirit and opinions of the time of the exile when it was produced. This Priest-Codex is also called the Book of the Four Covenants, (designated Q., from the Latin *Quatuor.*) After the exile Ezra or one of his generation constructed our present Pentateuch by a free use of all these documents, and also of other materials at his command. ‖

Edward Reuss, of Strasburg, claims to have advanced this theory as early as the year 1834, and says that in many respects it was with him "a product of intuition." ¶ After slowly elaborating it in his university lectures for nearly half a century,

* Issued in two parts. London, 1867, 1872.

† In his Vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels und seine Erweiterungen. Strasburg, 1874.

‡ The Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua Critically Examined. Seven parts. London, 1862–79. This series of publications from a Bishop of the Established Church, especially the first few parts, greatly stirred up the English theological world, and called out a library of replies.

§ Der Prophet Ezechiel. Leipzig, 1880.

‖ Wellhausen's views appear in his essay on the Composition of the Hexateuch in the Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie, (1876–77;) in his edition of Bleek's Einleitung in das A. T., (Berlin, 1878,) and in his Geschichte Israels, Erster Band. Berlin, 1878. New edition, entitled Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels. 1883.

¶ Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften A. T., p. vii. Braunschweig, 1881.

he has recently published his matured critical analysis and arrangement of the whole body of Old Testament literature in a large octavo, entitled "The History of the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament." He traces the composition of the Pentateuch through four distinct stages, the oldest portion of which was first compiled in the time of Jehoshaphat. This was subsequently revised and supplemented with important additions by the Jehovist. The third great contribution was made by the Deuteronomist in the time of Josiah, and the fourth, containing the Levitical legislation, was incorporated with the whole after the exile. W. R. Smith's position is not materially different from that of the school of Reuss, though he presents his views with greater moderation and caution. He distinguishes three separate groups of laws, which he calls the First Legislation, (Exod. xxi–xxiii,) the Deuteronomic Code, (especially Deut. xii–xxvi,) and the Levitical Legislation, which is scattered through Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. The exact date of Deuteronomy is not determined, but "the book became the programme of Josiah's reformation, because it gathered up in practical form the results of the great movement under Hezekiah and Isaiah, and the new divine teaching then given to Israel."* The distinctive features of the Levitical legislation were first sketched by Ezekiel, afterward developed in numerous details, incorporated with many ancient laws and traditions, and adapted "to the circumstances of the second temple, when Jerusalem was no longer a free State, but only the center of a religious community possessing certain municipal privileges of self-government."† So far as these laws or writings are ascribed to Moses, they are to be understood merely as a legitimate continuation of a cultus which began with Moses. They were by conventional usage, or legal fiction, called ordinances of Moses, but every one would understand that they were not of Mosaic authorship.

The adverse criticism of the Pentateuch has called out numerous replies from scholars who have steadfastly defended the traditional belief. Among the most eminent of these we may name, of the older writers, Carpzov, Witsius, Vitringa, and Calmet; and, in later times, Hengstenberg, Hävernick, Keil,

* The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, p. 363. Edinburgh, 1881.

† *Ibid*, p. 382.

M'Donald, and Green. Not a few of the ablest and most satisfactory answers to the several theories above detailed are to be found in the higher periodicals of Germany, England, and America. These vary in their methods of defense, some admitting numerous documents and interpolations, while others are slow to concede that any thing save the account of Moses's death is inconsistent with Mosaic authorship.

Results of Criticism.

What now, we may ask, are the results of all this critical study of the Pentateuch? It will be conceded, by every one competent to judge, that the researches and discussions of the Higher Criticism have developed a more thorough and scientific study of the Old Testament. Philological, archæological, and historical questions connected with Hebrew literature have been investigated with rich results to the cause of sacred learning. As to the origin and authorship of the Pentateuch, we regard the following propositions as fairly settled:

1. The Pentateuch contains a number of passages which cannot, without doing violence to sound critical principles, be attributed to Moses as their author.

2. The Pentateuch, especially the Book of Genesis, contains documents of various dates and authorship, which have been worked over into an orderly and homogeneous whole.

3. The laws of the Pentateuch were either unknown or else very largely neglected and violated during most of the period between the conquest of Canaan and the Babylonian captivity.

4. The Books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers show different stages of legislation, and Leviticus contains a noticeably fuller and more elaborate priestly code and ritual than appear in Deuteronomy.

We are frank to say that we regard the above propositions as simple statements of fact. But the divergent and conflicting opinions detailed in the foregoing pages admonish us that many unsound and illogical conclusions may be drawn from well-established facts. It is one thing to recognize positive results of criticism; quite another to accept theories which the critics build, or assume to build, upon such results. The discussion of the four propositions stated above must be reserved for another article.

ART. II.—THE OPIUM TRAFFIC IN CHINA.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

THE previous article on this subject having treated of the history of the traffic, it is proposed in the present article to consider its results, to show what has been and is the Chinese opinion in regard to it, to discuss the relation of the United States to the trade, to trace the efforts that have been made for its suppression, and to indicate what ought to be done to accomplish that result.

II. THE RESULTS OF THE TRAFFIC.

If the opium trade were in itself devoid of all evil qualities, there would still be no justification for the methods by which it has been imposed upon the Chinese nation; but its iniquity appears in still more hideous proportions when we survey its results.

1. *The results to the victims of the traffic.*—Occasionally some one has been found with hardihood enough to deny that any evil result comes from opium-smoking in general, and even to affirm that it is rather a harmless indulgence. Probably the most notable instance of this sort is to be found in a letter addressed by Messrs. Jardine, Matheson, & Co., of Hong-Kong, to the governor of that colony in 1867. The British Treaty with China was about to be revised, and this mercantile firm, well known as the most extensive dealers in opium of all the merchants in China, solicited the governor to bring their views in regard to the revision before the British government. In this letter they say:

> Since 1860 it has been rendered abundantly clear that the use of opium is not a curse, but a comfort and a benefit, to the hard-working Chinese. As well say that malt is a curse to the English laborer, or tobacco one to the world at large! Misuse is one thing; use, another. If to a few the opium pipe has proved a fatal snare, to many scores of thousands, on the other hand, has it been productive of healthful sustentation and enjoyment. Were we not well assured that these statements are true, we should not press this matter as we are now doing; but after the evidence of the past we feel justified in claiming that those who deal in opium shall be permitted to supply the inland Chinese with the drug as freely as are the dwellers at the ports.

It is not difficult to detect in this extract the special pleading of an interested party, or to trace the similarity of its arguments to those of the liquor-seller; but it seems passing strange that a firm of reputable merchants would dare put forth such a statement where it must necessarily be scrutinized by intelligent people. Once in a while a physician, whose handsome support was derived from opium-dealing firms, has uttered like opinions; and from time to time such views have been expressed by defenders of the traffic in the halls of Parliament. But the unvarying and overwhelming testimony of Chinese statesmen and people, of British officials, of travelers, of medical men, and of missionaries, shows, beyond all question, the terrible effect of the death-dealing drug.

Prince Kung and his colleagues, in a dispatch to the British Minister in 1869, say:

> That opium is like a deadly poison, that it is most injurious to mankind, and a most serious provocative of ill feeling, is, the writers think, perfectly well known to his Excellency, and it is therefore needless for them to enlarge further on these points.

The K'euen Keae Shay, a Chinese society for the promotion of abstinence from opium, embracing many mandarins and gentlemen of high rank in Canton and its vicinity, in reply to an address of the Anglo-Oriental Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade, in 1876, say of the effects of opium-smoking that,

> 1. It squanders wealth. 2. It interrupts industry. 3. It destroys life. 4. It cramps talent. 5. It disorganizes government. 6. It enfeebles the defenders of the country. 7. It loosens the bonds of society. 8. It corrupts the morals of the people.

In an address issued by the same society to their countrymen, they say:

> Opium-smoking ruins family estates, destroys bodies and souls of men more than can be reckoned; and in recent times there is nothing which can compare with this in injuring the people. Yellow gold is given in exchange for this black dirt; fertile fields are planted with this poisonous thing. Every day, every month, its votaries increase. Those who were well off are reduced to rags; their fine houses and rich lands all quickly transmuted into a cloud of smoke. How terrible it is!

Sir Thomas Wade, the British Minister, in a dispatch to his own government, says:

> It is to me vain to think otherwise of the use of the drug in China than as of a habit many times more pernicious, nationally

speaking, than the gin and whisky drinking which we deplore at home. It takes possession more insidiously, and keeps its hold to the full as tenaciously. I know no case of radical cure. It has insured in every case within my knowledge the steady descent, moral and physical, of the smoker, and is so far a greater mischief than drink, that it does not, by external evidence of its effects, expose its victim to the loss of repute, which is the penalty of habitual drunkenness.

Mr. C. V. Aitchison, the Chief Commissioner of British Burmah, says:

The habitual use of the drug saps the physical and mental energies, destroys the nerves, emaciates the body, predisposes to disease, induces indolent and filthy habits of life, destroys self-respect; is one of the most fertile sources of misery, destitution, and crime; fills the jails with men of relaxed frames, predisposed to dysentery and cholera; prevents the due extension of cultivation and the development of the land revenue; checks the natural growth of the population, and enfeebles the constitution of succeeding generations.

These are certainly strong testimonies from the highest Chinese and British sources. Let us now call to the stand physicians of eminent repute who have personally witnessed the effects of opium-smoking in China. J. L. Maxwell, M.D., for many years engaged in hospital work at Amoy and on the island of Formosa, says:

When the daily habit is entered upon, a few weeks are sufficient to make the effort to throw off the chain so severe a tax, alike on the physical and moral strength of a man, that without help he rarely comes off the victor. It is this insidious and quiet and comparatively speedy way in which it takes firm hold of its victim that renders opium-smoking so much more dangerous a vice in many respects than spirit-drinking.

William Gauld, M.D., for eighteen years in hospital work at Swatow, says:

The opium-smoker has a peculiar sallow skin, and usually blue, congested lips. This arises from the effect of opium. It acts upon every nerve-cell, and probably every nerve-fiber. At first the effect of it is slightly stimulant, but afterward it is depressing and deadening, and the more a man smokes opium the more his whole system gets deadened. That is to say, his functions are not in a normally active state. This is manifested in a very simple way. For instance, the bowels of the opium-smoker do not act perhaps oftener than once in ten days, or once in fifteen days, and sometimes once a month. I have known such cases. It is the same with respiration. The blood gradually becomes

less and less oxidized, and the venous system becomes congested. Hence you have that blue state of the lips and the shortness of breath of a confirmed opium-smoker.

D. B. M'Cartee, M.D., after twenty-five years' experience in his profession at Ningpo, wrote as follows:

As to the effects of opium upon the smokers, 1. Physically: it enervates them, gradually undermines their constitutions, and very frequently, either from their inability to procure the drug, or from its losing its effect upon them, or (as in several instances that have come under my observation) owing to a resolute endeavor to break off the habit, an incurable "opium diarrhea" sets in, and carries off the victim in a short time. 2. Morally: it not only undermines the physical constitution, it also blunts the moral sense, and in aggravated or even confirmed cases there is no depth of meanness or depravity to which the poor wretches will not stoop to stop the insupportable craving for the drug.

He mentions two cases which had come under his own personal observation of young men whose habit of opium-smoking had led them into such scandalous conduct that their own parents, with the approval of the head men of their clan, caused them to be sewn up in mats, thrown into the river, and drowned!

Much more medical testimony might be adduced if our space would allow. Let us listen to the evidence of a few travelers. The Abbé Huc, the celebrated Roman Catholic traveler, says:

With the exception of some rare smokers, all others advance rapidly toward death, after having passed through successive stages of idleness, debauchery, poverty, the ruin of their physical strength, and the complete prostration of their intellectual and moral faculties. Nothing can stop a smoker who has made much progress in the habit.

M. Carné, after his return from his travels in China, wrote in the *Revue des Deux Mondes:*

I do not believe there has ever been a more terrible scourge in the world than opium. The alcohol employed by Europeans to destroy savages, the plague that ravages a country, cannot be compared to opium.

Mr. T. T. Cooper, the celebrated English traveler, says:

It is a very common thing to see half-naked men lying dead, simply from want of opium. It leads to crime in every way. Men will sell their children, their wives, their mothers, their fathers, to get opium.

Mr. R. N. Fowler, M. P., in giving an account of his visit to China, says:

Mr. Nye, a merchant of long experience, said that of the ten great Hong merchants who carried on the trade when he came to Canton forty-two years ago, the families of nine had been ruined by opium-smoking. A town was mentioned which is becoming depopulated by it. Literary men smoke a great deal, and young men often take to it and are ruined. . . . Dr. Eitel took me to an opium-boiling establishment. There were eighteen men at work preparing it to be put in boxes and sent to California. Dr. Dudgeon had shortly before visited this place and questioned the proprietor, who said he considered opium a great evil, and did not allow any of his men to smoke it, but he carried on the business for the sake of profit. One cannot wonder at this reasoning in a heathen. This and other houses are in connection with a man who farms the right to boil opium, and pays $120,000 a year for three years to our government for it. Dr. Eitel considers that it is destroying the population, as opium-smokers have no children.

Missionaries of all nationalities, and of all denominations, are unanimous in their testimony as to the evil effects of the drug. It is only possible to give the words of a few representative men.

The Rev. Walter Medhurst, D. D., for forty years a faithful missionary of the London Missionary Society, says:

Calculating the shortened lives, the frequent diseases, and the actual starvation which are the result of opium-smoking in China, we may venture to assert that this pernicious drug annually destroys myriads of individuals. . . . Slavery was not more productive of misery and death than is the opium traffic, nor were Britons more implicated in the former than in the latter.

Mr. Alexander Wylie, who was for seventeen years superintendent of the London Missionary Society's press at Shanghai, and afterward for fifteen years traveled extensively through the empire as agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, says:

Any one who has lived half of that time [that is, half of twenty years] among the Chinese, can scarcely have a doubt as to the destructive effects of opium, physically, mentally, and morally. Undoubtedly this is one of the greatest evils with which China is affected, and, unless some means be found to check the practice, it bids fair to accomplish the utter destruction, morally and physically, of that great empire.

The Rev. Griffith John, for nearly thirty years a missionary of the London Missionary Society at Shanghai and Hankow, says:

> Opium is not only robbing the Chinese of millions of money year by year, but is actually destroying them as a people. It undermines the constitution, ruins the health, and shortens the life of the smoker, destroys every domestic happiness and prosperity, and is gradually effecting the physical, mental, and moral deterioration of the nation as a nation. The Chinese tell us that a large proportion of the regular opium-smokers are childless, and that the children of the others are few, feeble, and sickly. They also affirm that the family of the opium-smoker will be extinct in the third generation.

The Rev. F. W. Baller, of the China Inland Mission, who was very active in the relief of the sufferers in the great famine of 1876, says:

> I was in the province of Shan-si, and the native testimony is that those who first suffered, and on whom the famine had the greatest effect, were opium-smokers. They were carried off first. . . . I believe that in these famine-smitten districts . . . millions of men were carried off simply from the fact that their whole constitution was undermined by the practice of opium-smoking.

The Rev. Dr. Legge, Professor of the Chinese Language and Literature at Oxford University, says:

> It is as certain as any thing can be that the opium traffic, unless it be arrested, will reduce the empire of China to beggary and ruin.

Similar testimonies might be added by the hundred. The great Missionary Conference at Shanghai in 1877 gave voice to the unanimous conviction of the missionaries of China in its resolution "that opium-smoking is a vice highly injurious, physically, morally, and socially."

2. *The results on missionary work.*—Turning now from the effect of the opium traffic upon those who use the drug, to consider its effect upon the missionary work, we shall find it to be one of the greatest obstacles to the progress of Christianity among the Chinese people.

When Bishop Schereschewsky, of the American Protestant Episcopal Church, visited the ancient city of Kai-feng-fu in the province of Honan, in 1869, a crowd gathered about him, and quickly expelled him from the city, shouting after him, "You burned our palace, you killed our Emperor, *you sell poison to the people*, and now you come to teach us virtue!"

The Bishop of Victoria testifies that again and again, while preaching, he has been stopped with the question, "Are you an Englishman? Is not that the country the opium comes from? Go back and stop it, and then we will talk about Christianity."

The native Christians of Canton, in their address to the Anti-Opium Society, speak in emphatic terms of the opium traffic as a hinderance to the propagation of the truth. They testify that they constantly hear the heathen Chinese saying:

> The foreigners who preach the doctrine of Jesus affirm that he taught men to love others as themselves, and always to bear in mind the Golden Rule; but every year they import opium into China, and injure thereby millions of their fellow-creatures. Lately the quantity imported has increased, and the injury it produces has increased in proportion; as if they meant to carry off all the wealth of China, and to drain away the life-blood of the people before they stop. When men only think of what profits themselves, and are regardless of the injury done to others to such an extent as this, how can they be said to love others as themselves? How can we believe their doctrine and follow their religion?

The heathen Anti-Opium Society of Canton says to the Anti-Opium Society of England:

> Since the removal of the restrictions from the opium trade, the profits accruing therefrom have been shared only by a few of your countrymen resident in China, while the rest, who have been pursuing other lawful callings, are, by the Chinese, mixed up with them, *and all are tarred with the same brush.* . . . Your countrymen come here to preach the Gospel, and their object is to make converts, and thus spread abroad the love of God to men. But their hearers continually ask, "Why don't you go home and exhort your own people not to sell opium, since you are so bent on exhortation?" And it is impossible for the missionaries entirely to stop their mouths. On this account not only are few converts made, but the whole Christian doctrine is suspected to be an imposition. Thus the zeal of your missionaries is wasted.

The same society in another document says:

> Suppose the case reversed, and that some other nation had a poisonous article which was injurious to great Britain. We know well Great Britain would not suffer it to be brought to her own detriment. And if you would object to its being brought, you ought equally object to its being sent to hurt others. The New Testament says again, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." *Is it possible that the instruction of the Saviour has never yet reached the ear of your honored country?*

There can be no question that there is a very deep and genuine feeling among the Chinese people that this awful traffic is a great wrong, utterly indefensible on any moral ground. The above extracts indicate how this feeling constantly rises up in objection to a religion which is brought to them by the same people who bring the opium. It is not easy for them to make the distinction between nominal and real Christians, and when missionaries endeavor to teach such distinction, in answer to the objections to Christianity growing out of this traffic, the ever-recurring reply is, "Why don't you get your own people to be real Christians, then?" So every-where this traffic and its results become an obstacle of the most formidable character. It is doubtful whether the idolatrous habits and customs of centuries are as much in the way of the triumph of Christianity to-day as is this accursed traffic. It is an omnipresent and awful reality, affecting all classes of society. Its direful work has become familiar to the people before the Gospel messenger appears, and it shuts their hearts against his message. The calm judgment of the men best fitted to formulate an opinion was expressed by the General Conference at Shanghai when it said of the opium trade, "that, both from its past history and its present enormous extent, producing suspicion and dislike in the minds of the Chinese, it is a most formidable obstacle to the cause of Christianity."

3. *Its results to India.*—Looking at the amount of revenue derived from the trade by the government of India, it may be called a very profitable traffic. In the parliamentary discussion of 1840, Lord Ellenborough advocated the continuance of the growth of opium in India, because of the great revenue derived from it, amounting then to $7,500,000, which, as he said, was "in effect *a tax on foreigners.*" This has since grown into an average annual revenue of $35,000,000. On the other hand, there can be no doubt that poppy cultivation has wasted the soil of India to a very serious degree. Twenty-five years ago the East India Company affirmed in a statistical paper that "the poppy requires the richest description of land." Its extended production must therefore displace other products. Some of the finest grain-growing lands of Benares, Behar, and other regions are covered with the blighting poppy. A careful estimate, published in the London "Times" of Dec. 9,

1873, showed 100,000 acres of the rich plains of Central India and 550,000 acres in the alluvial valley of the Ganges given up to the poppy—ground which had previously produced sugar, indigo, corn, and other grain. India has been subject at times to great famines, which have carried off thousands of the people, and brought disease and distress upon multitudes. The rich province of Behar has suffered greatly from this cause; and while her people were dying by the thousand from starvation, many thousands of acres of her rich soil were blooming with the deadly poppy. The natives of India were starving that the natives of China might be poisoned through the agency of the Indian government, and for the purpose of increasing the dollars in its coffers. It would be difficult to conceive of any thing more shameful and wicked than such a condition of things as these facts reveal. The traffic which curses China is cursing India as well by the great and increasing waste of its most valuable soil. Besides this, it has proved a positive hinderance to public improvements, which there is high authority for saying "would have been more earnestly attended to but for the easy way of getting revenue by the growth and sale of opium."

4. *Its effect upon general trade.*—As long ago as 1839, Captain Eliot, her Majesty's Superintendent of Trade, wrote to Lord Palmerston:

> After the most deliberate reconsideration of this course of traffic, I declare my own opinion that, in its general effects, *it is intensely mischievous to every branch of trade.*

In 1842 a memorial was presented to Sir Robert Peel, bearing the signatures of 235 merchants and manufacturers of the highest standing, setting forth the obstacles interposed by the opium trade to an increased demand for British goods. They give it as their opinion that "the opium trade, in whatever form, will inevitably undermine the commerce of Great Britain with China." They show that from 1803 to 1839, while the opium trade had grown from 3,000 to 30,000 chests, the products of British industry purchased by the Chinese were $750,000 less in amount than was paid for woolens alone in 1803–8. The Chinese have no antipathy to foreign manufactures. The great difficulty is that opium preoccupies the market. An annual drain of thirty-six millions of dollars for opium must, in the

nature of things, interfere materially with the ability of the Chinese to purchase manufactured goods. The Tau-tai of Shanghai was once asked what would be the best means of increasing British commerce with China. He immediately replied: "Cease to send us so much opium, and we shall be able to take your manufactures." Mr. David M'Laren gives figures to show that China, with her four hundred millions of people, only imports about as much of British manufactures as Egypt or Cuba, and that opium, which formed scarcely one half of the export trade of Great Britain to China in 1813, had grown to be ninety per cent. of the whole in 1858. He then adds:

> It is impossible to resist the conclusion to be drawn from these tables. If the Chinese take value for their exports in one form, they cannot at the same time take it in another; and further, as will be seen shortly, the more they take in opium, the more they diminish their productive power and subsequent ability to become profitable customers in any trade.

The Rev. Goodeve Mabbs, with abundant statistics to indorse his assertion, says:

> Depend upon it, there is no greater barrier, both politically and economically, to the extension of British trade with China than our British Indian opium trade. The seven or eight millions of revenue which India obtains from the traffic really come out of the till of the British manufacturer and from the resources of the British people.

The London bankers, in a letter to the Chambers of Commerce, say:

> English industry is practically shut out from the market which, of all others, seems to offer the greatest possibilities of increase and expansion; and this, not from any unwillingness on the part of the government or people of China to receive our manufactures, but through the calamitous operation of a monopoly which exists for the sake of bringing in revenue to the Indian exchequer. The purchasing power of China seems paralyzed by the opium trade, while the Indian budget rests upon a basis which must give way the moment China is strong enough to assert herself.

Of course, America has as much interest in this aspect of the question as England. China ought to be one of the best fields in the world for many of our manufactures. But this opium blight is upon every thing. It has nearly paralyzed all

honest trade. The United States Consul at Ningpo, who has resided in China for thirty years, says in one of his annual reports to our government:

> Poverty makes bad customers; and so, whatever vices or circumstances tend to place our customers in this condition (as is pre-eminently the case with opium) *injure our business.*

Our legitimate commerce suffers immeasurable damage from this trade in opium, and no class would profit more by the total abolition of the traffic than our own merchants. Relieved of this incubus, trade would soon find its way to legitimate channels. The first development would probably be in largely increased sales of our cotton manufactures, and this would soon be followed by large imports of other useful articles. But up to this time opium, by exhausting to so large an extent the purchasing power of China, has been a powerful obstacle to the expansion of healthful trade.

III. Chinese Opinion.

This branch of the subject has been necessarily anticipated to some extent; but it is desirable to show how steady and uniform has been the condemnation of the traffic by all classes of the Chinese people. The great Emperor Tau-kwang declared that

> The injury done by the influx of opium and by the increase of those who inhale it is nearly equal to a conflagration, and the waste of property and the hurt done to human beings is every day greater than the preceding.

One of the most remarkable expressions of Chinese opinion is the letter of the Commissioner Lin, who destroyed the opium in Canton harbor, to Queen Victoria. A few extracts will give an idea of its style and of its reasoning:

> But there is a tribe of depraved and barbarous people who, having manufactured opium for smoking, bring it hither for sale, and seduce and lead astray the simple folk, to the destruction of their persons and the draining of their resources. Formerly the smokers thereof were few, but of late from each to other the practice has spread its contagion, and daily do its baneful effects more deeply pervade the central source, its rich, fruitful, and flourishing population. . . . How can it be borne that the living souls that dwell within these seas should be left willfully to take a deadly poison! Hence it is that those who deal in opium, or

who inhale its fumes within this land, are all now to be subjected to severest punishment, and that a perpetual interdict is to be placed on the practice so extensively prevailing. We have reflected that this poisonous article is the clandestine manufacture of artful schemers and depraved people of various tribes under the dominion of your honorable nation. Doubtless you, the honorable Sovereign of that nation, have not commanded the manufacture and sale of it. . . . Though not making use of it one's self, to venture, nevertheless, on the manufacture and sale of it, and with it to seduce the simple folk of this land, is to seek ones' own livelihood by the exposure of others to death, to seek one's own advantage by other men's injury. And such acts are bitterly abhorrent to the nature of man, are utterly opposed to the ways of heaven. . . . We would now, then, concert with your honorable sovereignty means to bring to a perpetual end this opium, so hurtful to mankind: we in this land forbidding the use of it, and you in the nations under your dominion forbidding its manufacture. As regards what has been already made, we would have your honorable nation issue mandates for the collection thereof, that the whole may be cast into the depths of the sea. We would thus prevent the longer existence between these heavens and this earth of any portion of the hurtful thing.

If we turn from this expression of Commissioner Lin in 1839 to the letter of Prince Kung and his colleagues of the Tsung-li Yamen to Sir Rutherford Alcock in 1869, we will find that no change had taken place in thirty years in the opinion and feeling of the highest Chinese officials. They say:

The object of the treaties between our respective countries was to secure perpetual peace, but if effectual steps cannot be taken to remove an accumulating sense of injury from the minds of men, it is to be feared that no policy can obviate sources of future trouble. Day and night the writers are considering the question, with a view to its solution, and the more they reflect upon it the greater does their anxiety become, and, therefore, they cannot avoid addressing his Excellency very earnestly on the subject. That opium is like a deadly poison, that it is most injurious to mankind, and a most serious provocative of ill feeling, is, the writers think, perfectly well known to his Excellency. . . . If it be desired to remove the very root, and to stop the evil at its source, nothing will be effective but a prohibition, to be enforced alike by both parties. Again, the Chinese merchant supplies your country with his goodly tea and silk, conferring thereby a benefit upon her; but the English merchant empoisons China with pestilent opium. Such conduct is unrighteous. Who can justify it? What wonder if officials and people say that *England is willfully working out China's ruin*, and has no real

friendly feeling for her? . . . If his Excellency, the British Minister, cannot, before it is too late, arrange a plan for a joint prohibition, [of the traffic,] then, no matter with what devotedness the writers may plead, they may be unable to cause the people to put aside ill feeling, and so strengthen friendly relations as to place them forever beyond fear of disturbance. Day and night, therefore, the writers give to this matter most earnest thought, and overpowering is the distress which it occasions them.

Wen-seang, in a conversation with Sir Rutherford Alcock, reported by the latter in an official dispatch to the Earl of Clarendon, says:

How irreparable and continuous is the injury which we see inflicted upon the whole empire by the foreign importation of opium! If England would consent to interdict this—cease either to grow it in India, or to allow their ships to bring it to China—there might be some hope of more friendly feelings. No doubt there is a strong feeling entertained by all the *literati* and gentry as to the frightful evils attending the smoking of opium, its thoroughly demoralizing effects, and the utter ruin brought upon all who once give way to the vice. They believe the extension of this pernicious habit is mainly due to the alacrity with which foreigners supply the poison for their own profit, perfectly regardless of the irreparable injury inflicted, and naturally they feel hostile to all concerned in such a traffic.

One of the most recent and most emphatic expressions of high Chinese opinion is to be found in the letter of Li Hung Chang, the leading statesman of China, to the Anglo-Oriental Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade. It is dated at Tientsin, May 24, 1881. He says:

Opium is a subject in the discussion of which England and China can never meet on common ground. China views the whole question from a moral stand-point; England, from a fiscal. England would sustain a source of revenue in India, while China contends for the lives and prosperity of her people. The ruling motive with China is to repress opium by heavy taxation everywhere, whereas with England the manifest object is to make opium cheaper, and thus increase and stimulate the demand in China. . . . If it be thought that China countenances the import for the revenue it brings, it should be known that my government will gladly cut off all such revenue in order to stop the import of opium. My Sovereign has never desired his empire to thrive upon the lives or infirmities of his subjects. . . . The present import duty on opium was established, not from choice, but because China submitted to the adverse decision of arms. *The war must be considered as China's standing protest against legalizing such a revenue.*

Space can only be afforded for a single extract to show the opinion of the humbler classes of the Chinese people. The following is from the letter of the Chinese Christians of Hong-Kong to the Anti-Opium Society:

> Opium is a burning evil. The smoker loses his character, injures his business and property, ruins himself and his family, and shortens his life. . . . Opium-smoking is a fruitful source of robbery, theft, and all kinds of villainy. . . . It drains China of its wealth, to the enrichment of foreigners; but this is a small matter compared with the slavery in which it binds individuals and society. . . . The trade in opium is no better than trade in poison, and it differs from murder by the knife only in its slower operation. . . . Ill-gotten gain brings no blessing with it. At present gain is derived from opium by the calamity of China; the longer this goes on, the more intense hatred does it excite, and the more signal will be the retribution. The revolutions of destiny do not fail. You should not deceive yourselves by saying that China can be easily put down. There is a Heaven above us which weighs our doings without the slightest error.

To sum up in a word, Chinese opinion from the beginning has been in unvarying condemnation of the traffic, as bringing misery upon the people, and as being utterly unjustifiable and cruel on the part of Great Britain. Emperors, statesmen, officers, and people have steadily spoken with unanimous voice on this subject. And the worst of it is that their view of the case is plainly and unanswerably right.

IV. The Relation of the United States to the Trade.

So far as government action is concerned, our general policy has been to have no trouble about any thing with China, to keep on perfectly friendly terms with that country, to let the British and French fight their own battles, and when the war was ended, and treaties were to be made, to come in with the other nations, and secure for our country and our trade as much as was promised to any other country. This has been a very economical, and, on the whole, quite a successful, method of conducting affairs. It is true that the first treaty between the United States and China, in 1844, contained a prohibition of the opium traffic; but this clause was from the very first a dead letter. Almost from the beginning Americans had their share in the profitable but deadly traffic. For many years there was but one American mercantile firm in China

which had not more or less connection with the traffic, namely, that of Messrs. Olyphant & Co., which was always an honorable exception, it being a rule of the house that no opium should be bought or sold by the firm, that none should be transported on any vessel belonging to them, and that it should never be mentioned in their market reports. This stand was taken purely on moral grounds, and was the result of the conscientious conviction of the head of the firm, who was a consistent member of the Presbyterian Church. But, with this exception, American merchants freely participated in the gains of the unholy trade.

But in 1880 our government wished to negotiate a new treaty with China concerning the limitation of Chinese immigration to this country. The clamor for such a treaty was without a decent basis of reason, and was in contravention of our acknowledged principles and our consistent practice for a century. But this is not the place to discuss that question, and it is here introduced only as it is connected with the opium traffic. In the discussions between our commissioners and those of the Chinese government, the latter pointed out that Chinese laborers first went to America because they were greatly desired, and that the new desire that they should stay away was due to the influence of violent men. They, however, agreed to a treaty allowing our government to limit or suspend the immigration of laborers. Now, it is a principle firmly rooted in the Chinese mind that when a concession has been made on one side, there must be a concession on the other side. And when China conceded to us the right to limit immigration, what did she ask in return? Simply that we would help her to get rid of the traffic in opium. This request was made when the "commercial treaty" was under consideration, it having been well understood that the treaty in regard to immigration should be followed by said commercial treaty. Our commissioners, Messrs. Angell, Swift, and Trescot, in their letter to Secretary Evarts, of November 17, 1880, say:

> The Chinese commissioners submitted a proposition which we had, from information received, been expecting, but of which they had so far given no sign. That was the prohibition of trade in opium to citizens of the United States. We knew that the Chinese government was very anxious to introduce such an article in any new treaties which they might make. . . . Since our arrival

here, we had had some opportunity of learning how thoroughly sincere the Chinese government was in its desire to suppress this mischievous trade, and we believed that the government had in this effort the entire sympathy both of the government and people of the United States. We therefore agreed to adopt the article, [on certain conditions which they name.]

The treaty thus agreed to was ratified by the President and the Senate. For a thorough-going and concise specimen of prohibition, Article 2 of that treaty cannot be too highly commended. It is as follows:

ARTICLE 2. The governments of China and of the United States mutually agree and undertake that Chinese subjects shall not be permitted to import opium into any of the ports of the United States; and citizens of the United States shall not be permitted to import opium into any of the open ports of China, to transport it from one open port to any other open port, or to buy or sell opium in any of the open ports of China. This absolute prohibition, which extends to vessels owned by the citizens or subjects of either power, and employed by other persons for the transportation of opium, shall be enforced by appropriate legislation on the part of China and the United States, and the benefits of the favored nation clause in existing treaties shall not be claimed by the citizens or subjects of either power as against the provisions of this article.

This treaty will not have much effect in stopping the opium trade as long as England is free to import as much of the drug as she pleases. But it gives China the moral support of the United States in her efforts against the traffic. Other nations will be asked to follow our example, as Russia has already done, and when many have responded, the weight of their example will be brought to bear upon England. Our country has never made a more honorable or righteous treaty with any foreign power. The "Friend of China," discerning the probable outcome of the treaty, says:

The inevitable issue is plainly discernible. For us Englishmen the alternative is this: Will you now, while you can do so in an honorable, though late, repentance, disentangle yourselves from this universally condemned trade, or will you brave the opinion of the world, and persist in the shameful traffic until it is closed for you by causes operating from without, leaving you bereft of its profits, but retaining the indelible infamy?

The present attitude of the United States toward the traffic is one of intense hostility, prohibiting our citizens from any par-

ticipation in it, and giving China our friendly aid in her efforts to secure its suppression. We suppose this is entirely constitutional, as it has passed the scrutiny of all the keen lawyers in the United States Senate, and received their votes. And if it be constitutional to prohibit our citizens in China from dealing in opium where every body else is at liberty to do it, ought it not to be constitutional for each State to debar its citizens from dealing in intoxicating liquor within its bounds? Ought it not to be as constitutional to protect American citizens as it is to protect Chinese subjects from a great curse? But this is a digression.

V. Efforts for the Suppression of the Traffic.

Individuals have not been lacking during the entire history of the traffic to protest against it and demand its suppression. Various religious bodies have also at times borne their testimony against it—the Society of Friends having in this, as in most other matters of public morals, an honorable record. In 1876 the Anglo-Oriental Society for the Suppression of the Opium Trade was organized. With the Earl of Shaftesbury as President, and the Bishops of Durham, Ripon, Salisbury, Liverpool, and Mid-China as Vice-Presidents, and the Rev. F. S. Turner as Secretary, and embracing in its membership many of the leading ministers and laymen of Great Britain, it has already greatly influenced the public opinion of the United Kingdom against the traffic. It issues monthly the "Friend of China," which gives the latest statistics, brings out in strong light the varied iniquities of the trade, and points out the appropriate action to be taken. It provides for holding meetings at various places, to awaken the people to the subject. It is active in preparing memorials to Parliament, and in agitating the subject in all suitable ways. It will doubtless be the leader of the Anti-Opium hosts, until victory is secured. There is a growing disposition among the religious assemblies to speak out upon the subject. The Convocation of York, in April, 1881, resolved:

> That in the opinion of this House, the opium trade as now carried on between India and China is opposed alike to Christian and national morality, is instrumental in effecting the physical and moral degradation of multitudes of Chinese, and is a hinderance both to legitimate commerce and to the spread of Christianity.

The Methodist Ecumenical Conference, held in London in September, 1881, resolved:

That the growth of the manufacture of opium in India and its export to China, under the direct sanction of the British imperial government, and as virtually a government monopoly, are serious obstacles to the spread of Christianity in China, and injurious to the credit and influence of England throughout the Eastern world. And we most respectfully but earnestly call upon the government to deliver this country from all further responsibility arising from such an iniquitous traffic.

The Friends, the Wesleyans, the New Connection Methodists, the Congregationalists, the Baptists, the English Presbyterians, the Established Church, and the Free Church of Scotland have all given their utterances against the traffic.

A small but noble band in the House of Commons bring forward every year resolutions looking to the termination of the traffic. No one undertakes to answer them on moral grounds. With England it is, as Li Hung Chang says, "a fiscal question," and most English statesmen decline as yet to view it from a moral stand-point.

VI. What Ought to be Done?

1. *By China.*—Being perfectly right in her view of the matter, and having the conscience of the world on her side, she ought to go steadily forward in her determination to suppress the trade. Every new treaty with a foreign nation ought to contain the same prohibition of opium that is found in her last treaty with the United States. She ought to insist upon England's giving up the legalization of the traffic. In the meantime, after giving due notice of her intentions, she ought to put on the drug a duty so high as to amount practically to prohibition. And in order to show her sincerity in the matter, she ought sternly to prohibit the growth of the poppy in her dominions, and take strict measures to enforce her edicts to that end.

2. *By Great Britain.*—The duty of Great Britain is very tersely stated in the resolutions of the great meeting called by the Lord Mayor of London, at the Mansion House, October 21, 1881, on which occasion the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Manning, and Bishop Simpson appeared on the same platform. It was there resolved:

That in the opinion of this meeting it is the duty of this country, not only to put an end to the opium trade as now conducted, but to withdraw all encouragement from the growth of the poppy in India, except for strictly medicinal purposes, and to support the Chinese government in its efforts to suppress the traffic.

That in the opinion of this meeting it will be the duty of this country to give such aid to the government of India as may be found reasonable, in order to lessen the inconvenience resulting to its finances from the adoption of the policy advocated in the previous resolution.

The Archbishop of Canterbury closed a strong speech at that meeting with these words:

I observed the other day that one of the articles of the treaty with China contained this clause: "That the Chinese were no longer to call us barbarians"—a most important clause. But what is more important than our not being called barbarians is that we should not act in any respect as barbarians, and forget that it is the duty of the civilized people to introduce among those whom we regard as less civilized than ourselves, not the vices, but the virtues of civilization, and so to help them in the cause of good government, which we trust, by God's blessing, the Chinese empire may gradually attain to.

Unquestionably, the right thing for the British government to do is to do right. The plea of necessity for India's finances is unworthy of serious attention. It can never be necessary to do a great wrong to one country in order to carry on the government of another. A nation that once voted $100,000,000 to free itself from the guilt and curse of slavery cannot be long staggered by the difficulty of raising sufficient revenue to carry on the government of India, when once its conscience is aroused to the duty of the hour.

3. *By all Christian and humane people.*—The duty of all who love their fellow-men is to give the aid of their earnest efforts to relieve the Chinese people of this great curse. All the great representative religious bodies should take strong action on the subject. As we have seen, this is being done to a large extent by the Churches of Great Britain. The leading Churches of America, all of which have large and flourishing missions in China, and all of whose missionaries meet this traffic as a great obstacle to the progress of the Gospel, ought to join in respectful remonstrances to the British government against the continuance of the traffic. Our General Confer-

ence might well take the initiative in the matter, and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, the General Synod of the Reformed Church, the Baptist Missionary Union, and the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, might all appropriately join in an earnest protest against the trade. Great Britain would ere long be obliged to listen to the universal protest of Christendom, and would soon find means either to decrease the expenses of the Indian government or to provide for them in some other way than by carrying ruin and death into countless thousands of Chinese homes. In the words of the Rev. S. Whitehead, formerly of the Wesleyan Mission at Canton:

> They tell us that the tide of the Solway Firth sometimes, when it comes up, is for a long time not observed, that there is no indication of its rise, that the waters seem sullen as if they would not move, but at last the tide comes up in its force and rushes forward with a speed that outpaces the fastest horseman; and often in the history of this country has it been so with the force, the great tide of public opinion; and I do hold that if we can keep at our work, by and by, that tide slowly rising, gaining strength, at present unobserved, but spreading from heart to heart, from mind to mind, and from home to home, will stir this nation, and rush into the British Houses of Parliament, and then will there come the destruction of this abominable traffic.

And let all the people say Amen!

Art. III.—THE REGENERATION AND GLORIFICATION OF THE BODY.

It has been generally perceived by the Christian Church that there is such a thing as regeneration of the soul, but it has not been so commonly noticed that there is also a regeneration of the body. It is the purpose of this paper to establish the proposition that at the time of the new birth of the soul a physical change, corresponding with the spiritual transformation, begins, which progresses with differing degrees of rapidity in different cases, and which finally culminates in the resurrection of the spiritual body which descended at death into the grave. In this physical regeneration the Spirit of God first "quickens" "our mortal body." After the "quickening" there is

carried forward a long process which may be compared to the gestation of the unborn child in the womb of its mother, and which is, in fact, the gestation of the spiritual body. In the womb of this time-world and within the matrix of this mortal there is preparation going on for some higher organization, as God's formative processes of development and discipline are mysteriously progressing during the whole of this earthly life. Then the body rests awhile in the grave, a stage which, since we are fallen, is doubtless an important part of our physical preparation for a spiritual existence, and which, we may conjecture, is necessary to rid us of our grosser parts. For, as we sing,

> "Corruption, earth, and worms
> Shall but refine this flesh;
> Till our triumphant spirit comes
> To put it on afresh."

At last the birth-hour of the resurrection arrives. The Spirit, who raised up Christ from the dead, and who quickened our physical organization at the hour of the new birth of the soul from above, now raises up the perfected spiritual body. To this whole process, including the final union and glorification with the soul, we may, for convenience' sake, apply the term, the regeneration and glorification of the body.

The process of regeneration, using that word in its widest sense, therefore includes in its operation both the material and the immaterial man. Its work is that of restoring us from the effects of sin upon our twofold nature. Its intention is to make things with us as though Adam had not fallen, as far as this can be done, and thus to aid us onward from our lost to our future and heavenly paradise. This design, proposing as it does to undo as much as possible the effects of sin, must necessarily include regeneration of the body. That this process is begun at least in the moment of the new birth from above, if not, indeed, when the repenting soul first seeks after God, we believe to be susceptible of abundant proof.

That there is a regeneration of the physical nature, commencing with the moment of spiritual change, is established by the teachings of physiology. It is axiomatic among physical scientists that mental changes are always accompanied by alterations of organic structure, either as cause or effect. Some

late words of Mr. Frederick Harrison, which are referred to with approbation by Professor Huxley,* may serve to represent the conclusions of science upon this close interaction of spirit and matter:

> Man is one, however compound. Fire his conscience, and he blushes. Check his circulation, and he thinks wildly, or thinks not at all. Impair his secretions, and moral sense is dulled, discolored, or depraved; his aspirations flag; his hope, love, faith, reel. Impair them still more, and he becomes a brute. A cup of drink degrades his moral nature below that of a swine. Again, a violent emotion of pity or horror makes him vomit. A lancet will restore him from delirium to clear thought. Excess of thought will waste his sinews; excess of muscular action will deaden thought. An emotion will double the strength of his muscles; and at last the prick of a needle or a grain of mineral will, in an instant, lay to rest forever his body and its unity, and all the spontaneous activities of intelligence, feeling, and action with which that compound organism was charged. These are the obvious and ancient observations about the human organism. But modern philosophy and science have carried these hints into complete explanations. By a vast accumulation of proof positive, thought at last has established a distinct correspondence between every process of thought or of feeling, and some corporeal phenomenon.

Now, in view of these facts, if it be admitted that the soul is but a function of the body, as materialism asserts, then the regeneration of the soul would indicate a previous physical change. If, on the contrary, the body is but the servant and instrument of the soul, as we believe, then such a spiritual crisis as the new birth would be at once accompanied by a corresponding bodily alteration. Thus, upon any hypothesis of the relation between soul and body which we may adopt, a metamorphosis in the one would of necessity imply a like occurrence in the other.

This teaching of science is confirmed, in the second place, by common observation. In the majority of instances, perhaps, regeneration manifests itself at once by a variety of physical signs, and especially is this true when it is experienced in the marked, "Methodist," way. Sometimes the change is so great, notably in adults, that it is manifest in gait, in tone of voice, or even in the glance of the eye. Of course these are distinguished instances; but what is true of them is, in the very

* "A Modern Symposium," p. 74.

nature of things, true of all in a measure, since natural and spiritual laws are not variable in their operation. Still more decided is the physical change, when evil appetites are eradicated in a moment. A bodily re-adjustment to better habits and a purer life seems to occur. The physical basis of the artificial or perverted appetite appears to be transformed and the evil desire of which it was the cause vanishes. Drunkards feel the appetite for liquor removed, and users of tobacco lose their cravings for the narcotic. Such cases are numerous and well attested. Once, the confession of such a deliverance from sinful appetites would have subjected him who made it to the charge of enthusiasm, but now the experience is so common and so well proven as scarcely to excite remark.* It is found that the doctrine of a physical change commencing, and more or less present, in every case of regeneration, accounts rationally for these phenomena; and wherever they occur an explanation upon physical grounds is thus provided in advance.

Finally, this doctrine of a physical change accompanying spiritual regeneration is taught in the Scriptures. One of the proof texts is Romans viii, 11: "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." We are aware that this passage is often popularly interpreted as relating exclusively to the final resurrection of the body, but a study of the context will show that if any allusion to this resurrection is intended at all it is only secondary. The primary reference is to that physical change which begins in the body at regeneration, and which mysteriously culminates in the resurrection. Calvin, who follows the comment of Augustine in this matter, says of this passage: "The discourse is not concerning the final resurrection, which occurs in a moment, but concerning the continual operation of the Spirit, who, gradually putting to death the remains of the flesh, begins a celestial life in us.†" Alford adopts Calvin's idea, with the caution that "perhaps 'not *alone* concerning the final resurrection' would have been more correct, for it certainly is one thing spoken of." And with this

* "Wonders of Grace," W. H. Boole; Dr. Cullis's "Reports;" "Nature and the Supernatural," Bushnell, chap. xiv; etc., etc.

† "Commentary," in loco.

agree substantially Bengel, Tholuck, Meyer, Stuart, Lange, Van Doren, and, indeed, all the commentators we have noticed on the passage.

Paul has not once, in the preceding verses of the paragraph, referred to the final resurrection, and any exclusive allusion to it is foreign to the scope of his writing, which seems to relate wholly to the change which takes place in regeneration. He tells us (1) what is done for the soul, and (2) what is done for the body. (1) The teaching of the whole epistle previously is that the soul of man, as yet spiritually lifeless, is now "quickened." (2) Then the specific declaration is made that the mortal body is "quickened." The plain implication is, therefore, that the work is simultaneous in both; and no other view would have occurred had it not come to be carelessly assumed, contrary to the spirit of the whole passage and to the teaching of all the scholars, that the "quickening" of the "mortal body" here referred to was to take place in the final resurrection. Moreover, if Paul had intended to speak exclusively of the final resurrection he would have used the same fitting word—*ἐγείρας*—which he did in the same verse in speaking of the Saviour's resurrection, instead of choosing a different one—*ζωοποιήσει*—which simply means "to make alive," either physically or spiritually, and which does not necessarily refer to a future any more than it does to an earthly life. The idea of the passage is, that the body, hitherto "dead in trespasses and sins," is now, in regeneration, "made alive" with the new life, which is to eventuate in the resurrection.

Another scriptural proof of our position is found in many of the terms which Paul applies to the unregenerate state. Why does he say, "They that are *in the flesh* cannot please God?" Why does he speak of the "*body of sin*" and the "*old man?*" Why is sin always, in his mode of speaking, made cognate with the "*carnal*" and the "*fleshly?*" Why does he declare "the *carnal mind* is enmity against God," "the *flesh* lusteth against the Spirit," and the like? Why, in speaking of himself in his unregenerate state, does he say, "In my *flesh* dwelleth no good thing?" Why does he speak of the "*lust of the flesh?*" Such examples of his usage might be multiplied indefinitely.

Certainly all this uniformity of allusion to the "body of sin" is neither an arbitrary thing nor an accidental collocation of words, for Paul was not a person to use language thus, even leaving out of view, if we could, his inspiration. And these words must be something more than mere pretty fancies or barren figures of speech. Indeed, they could not be valid figures of speech unless they had some deeper likeness to reality than that of mere sound or of superficial suggestion. They must rest for their significance upon some profound truth, and must derive their only value as vehicles of thought from the accuracy with which they express a great moral fact. A true figure of speech must, so to speak, contain the fact of which it is a symbol. And the truth upon which these expressions rest, the fact which they are intended to teach, is that the unchanged body is one of the chief sources of sin. This is so terribly true that, in the apostle's mode of thought, sin is always associated, if, indeed, it is not identified, with the presence of an unregenerate flesh. There is verily a tragic depth of meaning in Paul's lament for himself in his unrenewed state when he exclaims, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" This expression is not to be explained as a mere trope for a desired spiritual change, which has been suggested to his lively imagination by the practice of chaining a living prisoner to a corpse, but it is a cry for an actual physical deliverance from an unregenerate body—a deliverance which shall also accomplish the loosing of his spiritual nature from its loathed contact with corruption. We must interpret the passage thus to bring it into accord with the whole Pauline mode of thought. That deliverance he begins to receive in regeneration; and now, as a consequence, he cries out again with sharp joy, "I thank God through our Lord Jesus Christ!" And this joyous shout in the Romans has its antiphonal note in that jubilant pæan of the Corinthian epistle, which celebrates the final triumph of the redeemed body over sin and the grave in the final resurrection: "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

His joy for himself upon the renewal of his whole nature in righteousness was such as he afterward felt for the Colossians, who had been saved, as he says, in "putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." Col. ii, 11.

The mediæval schoolmen and Church fathers had caught a glimpse of Paul's idea that the unchanged body was the seat of sin; and therefrom, in part, they derived that doctrine of the depravity of matter which led to all the dreary excesses of asceticism. They made a mistake, however, when they began to mortify the flesh in order to attain deliverance from sin, for they began at the wrong end of the work. They should first have sought the kingdom of God and his righteousness in the regeneration of the soul, and then would all things pertaining to a physical renewal have been added unto them in due time, and physical mortifications have lost most of their necessity.

Their bodies would still have had to be kept under, as was Paul's, because not yet completely regenerate; and yet the revolt of the carnal man against the Spirit would have been in process of suppression.

The same idea of a physical along with a spiritual change is necessarily implied, if, indeed, it is not directly taught, in Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians, (v, 16, 17:) "Wherefore henceforth know we no man after the flesh: yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more. Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things have passed away; behold, all things are become new." The apostle is here alluding to what took place at his regeneration. Previously he had known both men and Christ from the old fleshly, sinful stand-point. Now, since he is born again, he knows both from a new, holy, spiritual stand-point. It comes to this at last, understand the phrase "after the flesh" any way we may. He continues that if any man has passed from the former to the later state it has been by a new creation. But this is necessarily both spiritual and physical. (1) Because a man is not properly a "new creature," that is, a new creation, until all parts of his complex nature, body as well as soul, are included in some degree in the recreative act. (2) Because, in order to pass from the old carnality to the new spiritual life, the physical basis of that carnality, which is the "flesh," must be transformed.

Our scriptural proof of this doctrine may be fitly concluded by a single quotation from the Epistle to the Colossians, which appears to us to contain all that we have endeavored to set

forth, (ii, 11–13:) "Ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: . . . And you, being dead in your sins, and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses." These Colossians were now regenerate persons when these statements were made concerning them, for they were "circumcised," and they had been "dead," but now they were "quickened." This deadness had not pertained solely to their spiritual nature, because it is said that, being already "dead in their sins," they were additionally dead "in the uncircumcision of their flesh." It would be mere tautology for Paul to use this second specification, unless it added a second idea; and what that idea was we have already discovered from his whole teaching. This "quickening" was not a future resurrection, for "you *hath* he quickened;" and it was accomplished at the same time they had received "forgiveness of all trespasses." With this we rest the argument and come to some practical thoughts.

The regeneration of the body is a matter of interest and importance to the sinner. He finds his physical nature one of the chief obstacles to his becoming a follower of Christ. The sinner is appalled by the view of his own lusts and evil appetites, and deterred thereby from entering upon the better life to which he feels himself called. But there is abundant provision made to meet his case. Perhaps these may be taken away in the beginnings of regeneration, or, perhaps, in his entire sanctification. We incline to the belief that they will be removed as soon as their removal is clearly apprehended as having been made possible to faith, and when that faith is exercised. While John B. Gough declares that the drunkard must always feel and struggle against evil appetite until he dies, we cannot concur; at least this seems not the invariable rule. If God sees best, he will doubtless confer an extraordinary charismatic faith,* which will effect its destruction. In other cases his grace will be sufficient. In others still the appetite will

* 1 Cor. xii, 9; "Quarterly Review," 1871, p. 443, note by D. D. Whedon; "The Charism of Faith," "Western Christian Advocate," June 30, 1881, J. C. Jackson; "The Gift of Faith and the Grace of Faith," "Christian Standard," March 31, 1883, Daniel Steele.

surely be greatly weakened. But we feel inclined to insist that, as a rule, there is gracious divine provision made for its removal, and that this may be savingly grasped and held. Of course we will still be sick, and still die, for all human experience shows that this part of the penalty of sin is not yet subject to removal. The provision for its destruction is not yet perfectly operative, nor will it be until the resurrection of the last day, which is the time appointed for disease and death to be entirely swallowed up in life. But for the removal of fleshly lusts and evil appetites the complete remedy is now perfectly available, and that remedy is *the precious blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.* Let the transgressor but look to it in faith, and we believe that as the bodies of the serpent-bitten Israelites were healed when they looked upon the uplifted image in the wilderness, so will the body of the sinner be cured of those evil appetites which are the result of his own misdeeds, or which, perhaps, have become his by inheritance.

There is also in this matter that which is of importance to Christians. Supposing that their bodies have been quickened, and that unholy lusts have been eradicated or repressed, then their members are to be held inviolably sacred to God, being yielded servants to righteousness. A Christian's soul is already, by anticipation, a celestial spirit, a citizen of heaven, for into that goodly fellowship it was introduced by the consecrating baptism of the Holy Ghost. His body is already, by anticipation, a spiritual body, one of the bodies of heaven, for into the regenerated nature which will compose the new heavens and the new earth it has been introduced by the consecrating baptism of water. Even now, with the whole creation, it groaningly awaits the full manifestation of the sons of God and the regeneration of all things. God's seal is upon the Christian's body, and it is to be held sacred. Let him beware of evil; although saved, he is not beyond temptation and falling, for even though his bodily and spiritual state were by a miracle of divine recreative energy made equal in perfection to that of unfallen Adam, he would not be beyond the possibility of lapse. By gratifying an innocent appetite with an unlawful object, our first parent fell into transgression, and in the same way have since fallen thousands once regenerate.

Finally, from this subject we gain some dim idea of part of

our perfection in heaven. To repeat some of the thoughts with which we began, we have seen that, in conversion, God "quickens" "our mortal bodies." After the quickening a long process ensues, which may be compared to gestation. Then our physical nature passes through the grave, doubtless a necessary stage in the preparation of the spiritual body. Somewhere and somehow, by this time, the physical nature has been freed from its carnality, inherited or acquired, so that now the purified physical nature is ready to be raised up. For, as Christlieb says:* "We must not forget that it is not earthly matter, *per se*, which is incapable of being developed into a spiritual state of existence, but only the defilement that cleaves to it in our fallen condition that prevents this. *The terrestrial body, as such, is destined to be spiritualized;* but if this is its destiny it must also possess the *capability.* This shows us at the same time the reason why the sinless body of Christ could be immediately transmuted. Its purity was the possibility of its transformation." Now, our own bodily purification being accomplished by the processes of grace and the grave, the birth-hour of the resurrection comes. The Spirit who raised up Christ, and who quickened aforetime our mortal bodies, now raises us up. The soul, already prepared in the intermediate state, next comes and takes possession of the prepared and perfect organ of its future activities. Then for the first time is realized the ancient philosophic dream of a sound mind in a sound body, though in a higher sense than was ever imagined. Then all the diseases and weaknesses that were the result of either our natural limitations or of the actual sins of the flesh are gone, because our physical man is wholly regenerated. The soul perfectly helps the body, and the body the soul, the old antagonism between the two having utterly vanished. This is part of the glorification of man in heaven, to which all Christians are now upon the way. Immortality already stirs within their ransomed spirits, and in their very bodies they feel the growing powers of the world to come.

* "Modern Doubt and Christian Belief," p. 476.

Art. IV.—WESTMINSTER ABBEY.

Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D., Dean of Westminster. Third and Revised Edition. London: John Murray. 1869. 8vo, pp. 704.

The fame of Westminster Abbey is world-wide. It stands, the index of Anglo-Saxon greatness, the monument of England's unquestioned stability. It is the historian of eight long centuries of British progress. It is a vast pile of Gothic architecture worth going many miles to see, ornamented without and within with all that the hand of skillful artisan and the purse of royalty itself could supply. It is earth's richest mausoleum, where scores, especially of those who were kings in the world of Mind, whose fame is more secure with every passing year, have been laid to rest. It has witnessed royal marriages, coronations, and burials, and is thus peculiarly endeared to Britain's sons. It challenges the admiration of hosts of others as well, visitors from afar, who have traversed again and again its long halls and walked reverently through its royal chapels.

> The Abbey of Westminster hath been always held the greatest sanctuary and randevouze of devotion of the whole island; whereunto the situation of the very place seems to contribute much and to strike a holy kind of reverence and sweetness of melting piety in the hearts of the beholders.*

The famous church has been eagerly sought out by visitors from every clime. Already in the reign of Elizabeth distinguished foreigners were taken in gondolas "to the beautiful and large royal church called Westminster." It is at least possible (the choice lies between Westminster, St. Paul's, or King's College, Cambridge) that it was in Westminster the youthful Milton

> "Let his dere feet never fail
> To walk the studious cloister pale,
> And love the high embowered roof
> With antick pillars massy proof,
> And storied windows richly dight
> Casting a dim, religious light."

Burke "visited the Abbey soon after his arrival in town," and the moment he entered he felt a kind of awe pervade his mind which he could not describe; "the very silence seemed

* Howell's "Perlustration of London," p. 346. 1657.

sacred." Horace Walpole loved Westminster Abbey "much more than levees and circles." Washington Irving was a close observer of its wonderful attractiveness.

The carefully prepared volume before us, dedicated to her Majesty Queen Victoria, "A humble record of the royal and national sanctuary which has for centuries enshrined the varied memories of her august ancestors, and the manifold glories of her free and famous kingdom, and which witnessed the solemn consecration of her own auspicious reign to all high and holy purposes," is doubly interesting on account of the large-heartedness of its illustrious author, who, so short a time ago, was laid to rest within the quiet walls of the Abbey he loved and served so well. We stood but yesterday by this newest grave of all, covered with wreaths of immortelles, the gifts of loving hearts, and thanked God again for the beautiful life of the great Dean Stanley. Were there no other, the volume before us would be a worthy monument of his highly cultured mind and his noble heart.

On the occasion of the eight hundredth anniversary of the dedication of the Abbey, in December, 1865, the friends of Dean Stanley, especially his associates at Westminster, expressed the desire that he would illustrate its history by Memorials similar to those he had previously published in connection with Canterbury Cathedral. The desire was complied with, and the result is the volume whose title-page we have quoted, and which must possess a lasting interest, not only to the historian and the ecclesiastical scholar, but to the archæological student and to the great world of English people every-where. Much had already been written on the Abbey, but none of the writers, it is safe to say, had enjoyed such rare facilities as did Dean Stanley for consulting original sources of information such as the Archives preserved in the Abbey, reaching back to the charters of the Saxon kings, the Chapter Books, extending from 1542 to the present, the Burial Registers, from 1606 to the present, and various other important MSS. The rare opportunity was appreciated and well improved.

As will be understood at once by those most familiar with the history of Westminster Abbey, the compiling such Memorials was no easy task; the very multitude of historical events with which the famous edifice has been connected in-

creased the difficulty; but out of the diversified materials before him with manifest painstaking our author educed a volume which must long remain an unquestioned authority, and commend itself to all who would know the Abbey. The opening chapter treats of the Foundation of the Abbey; the second describes the Coronations, from that of William the Conqueror, December 25, 1066, to that of Queen Victoria, June 28, 1838; the third tells of the Royal Tombs; the fourth describes the Monuments; the fifth the Abbey before the Reformation, (the Monastery, Cloisters, Treasury, Chapter House, Infirmary, etc.;) the sixth chapter gives a history of the Abbey since the Reformation. There are also interesting appendixes, addenda, and a chronological table of events. The pages are filled with helpful references which point the way to additional information.

In the interests of those who have not been privileged to visit London a few words of commonplace description may be admissible. Westminster Abbey stands in the western part of London within two hundred yards of the Houses of Parliament on the banks of the heavily burdened Thames, near Westminster Bridge. We are told that

> the devout king [Edward the Confessor] destined to God that place both for that it was near unto the famous and wealthy city of London, and also had a pleasant situation amongst fruitful fields lying round about it with the principal river running hard by, bringing in from all parts of the world great variety of wares and merchandise of all sorts to the city adjoining; but chiefly for the love of the chief apostle, whom he reverenced with a special and singular affection.*

The "fruitful fields" have long since given place to blocks of buildings and crowded streets, and the quietude which once so distinguished the place as a worthy site for church and monastery has disappeared; the cab, omnibus, and street-car rattle over the ground where formerly abbots and monks reverently paced, while the rush and roar of the world's great metropoli are heard on every side.

The Abbey church is cruciform. The length of the nave is 166 feet, the breadth 38, the height 101 feet; the breadth of the aisles is 16, the extreme breadth of nave and aisles, 71 feet; the length of the choir is 155, the breadth 38, the height 101

* Harleian MSS., p. 980.

feet; the length of transepts and choir is 203, the breadth of transepts and aisles, 84 feet. The extreme length of the Abbey, including Henry VII.'s chapel, is 530 feet; the height of the western towers is 225, of the north front, 166 feet. As it originally stood, the edifice was somewhat smaller; chapel after chapel has been added;* the two imposing towers at the western entrance are the work of Sir Christopher Wren, no mean monument of his great genius; and thus the building has grown to its present proportions. Its architectural beauty is best comprehended by surveying it from the north-west; the effect upon the mind of the spectator is not soon effaced, is never forgotten. One of the most gifted of the many brilliant writers who sleep here has well described "with a feeling beyond his age" the effect of the great cathedral on the awe-struck beholder:

> "All is hushed and still as death. 'Tis dreadful!
> How reverend is the face of this tall pile,
> Whose ancient pillars rear their marble heads
> To bear aloft its arched and ponderous roof,
> By its own weight made steadfast and immovable,
> Looking tranquillity! It strikes an awe
> And terror on my aching sight; the tombs
> And monumental caves of death look cold,
> And shoot a chillness to my trembling heart."

The site of the Abbey was formerly an island, (or peninsula,) and derived its name from its thickets of thorn—Thorn Ey, (or Dorney,) the Isle of Thorns—

which formed in their jungle a refuge for the wild ox or huge red deer with towering antlers, that strayed into it from the neighboring hills. This spot, thus intrenched, marsh within marsh and forest within forest, was, indeed, *locus terribilis*, "the terrible place," as it was called in the first notices of its existence; yet even thus early it presented several points of attraction to the founder of whatever was the original building which was to redeem it from the wilderness. It had the advantages of a Thebaid, as contrasted with the stir and tumult of the neighboring fortress of London.

The river flowing past swarmed with fish, the soil was salubrious, springs of pure water bubbled up in the center of the thickets.

* There are nine chapels: St. Benedict's, St. Edmund's, St. Nicolas's, Henry VII.'s, St. Paul's, Edward the Confessor's, St. Erasmus's, St. John the Baptist's, and Abbot Islip's chapel.

What was the first settlement in those thorny shades, amid those watery wastes, beside that bubbling spring, it is impossible to decipher. The monastic traditions maintained that the earliest building had been a temple of Apollo, shaken down by an earthquake in the year A. D. 154. But this is probably no more than the attempt to outshine the rival Cathedral of St. Paul's by endeavoring to counterbalance the dubious claims of the temple of Diana by a still more dubious assertion of the claims of the temple of her brother the sun-god.

Our author passes by the claims of King Lucius, who, it was said, converted the two London temples into churches; and also those of Sebert, (A. D. 616,) whose grave is still shown outside the Abbey. There is conclusive evidence that the Abbey was founded by Edward the Confessor, "the monument not merely of the personal piety, but of the personal character and circumstances of its founder." This king, who occupied so prominent a place in the history of England, was the last of the Saxons and the first of the Normans.

The idea of a regal Abbey on a hitherto unexampled scale may have been suggested or strengthened by the accounts brought back to him of Reims, where his envoys had been present at the consecration of the Abbey of St. Remy, hard by the cathedral in which the French kings were crowned. But the prevailing motive was of a more peculiar kind, belonging to times long since passed away. In that age, as still among some classes in Roman Catholic countries, religious sentiment took the form of special devotion to this or that particular saint. Among Edward's favorites St. Peter was chief. On his protection while in Normandy, while casting about for help, the exiled prince had thrown himself, and vowed that if he returned in safety he would make a pilgrimage to the apostle's grave at Rome.

When he came to the throne he announced to his Great Council his purpose of fulfilling his vow, but neither nobles nor people would listen to the proposal. The king at last gave way, a deputation was sent to the Pope, who released the royal suppliant from his vow on condition that he should found or restore a monastery of St. Peter, (the full title of Westminster Abbey is "The Collegiate Church or Abbey of St. Peter,") of which the king should be the especial patron.

The Abbey was fifteen years or more in building. The king spent upon it one tenth of the property of the kingdom.

It was to be a marvel of its kind. Its fame as a new style of composition lingered in the minds of men for generations. It

was the first cruciform church in England, from which all the rest of like shape were copied—an expression of the increasing hold which the idea of the crucifixion in the tenth century had laid on the imagination of Europe. Its massive roof and pillars formed a contrast with the rude wooden rafters and beams of the common Saxon churches. Its very size, occupying as it did almost the whole area of the present building, was in itself portentous. The deep foundations, of large square blocks of gray stone, were duly laid. The east end was rounded into an apse. A tower rose in the center, crowned by a cupola of wood. At the western end were erected two smaller towers with five large bells. The hard, strong stones were richly sculptured. The windows were filled with stained glass. The roof was covered with lead.—Pp. 26, 27.

At last the day of dedication arrived. "At midwinter," says the Saxon chronicle, "King Edward came to Westminster and had the minster there consecrated which he had himself built to the honor of God and St. Peter and all God's saints." The dedication occurred December 28, 1065, and a few days later, January 5, 1066, the Confessor died.

The first event in the Abbey of which there is any certain record, after the burial of the Confessor, was the coronation of William the Conqueror. No other coronation rite in Europe reaches back to so early a period as that of the sovereigns of Britain. According to tradition Arthur was crowned at Stonehenge. Of the Saxon kings, seven, from Edward the Elder to Etheldred, (A. D. 900–971) were crowned on the king's stone (still to be seen in the market-place of Kingston on Thames) by the first ford of the Thames. The Danish Hardicanute was believed to have been crowned at Oxford. William's selection of the newly dedicated church for the most important act of his life sprang directly from regard to the Confessor's memory. To be crowned beside the grave of the last Saxon king was the direct fulfillment of the whole plan of the Conqueror. The coronation occurred on Christmas day, A. D. 1066. What with the Saxon populace of London within the Abbey and the suspicious Norman soldiers without, the whole scene was marked by calamitous confusion, and the ceremony was hurried on and abruptly ended.

From this time forward the ceremony of the coronation has been inalienably attached to the Abbey. Its connection with the grave of the Confessor was long preserved even in its

minutest forms. The form of the oath, retained until the time of James II., was to observe "the laws of the glorious Confessor."

The following is a list of subsequent coronations: William Rufus, September 26, 1087; Henry I., August 5, 1100; Stephen, December 26, 1135; Henry II., December 19, 1154; Richard I., September 3, 1189; John, May 27, 1199; Henry III., October 28, 1216; Edward I., August 19, 1274; Edward II., February 25, 1308; Edward III., February 1, 1327; Richard II., July 16, 1377; Henry IV., October 13, 1399; Henry V., April 9, 1413; Henry VI., November 6, 1429; Edward IV., June 29, 1466; (Edward V., uncrowned;) Richard III., July 6, 1483; Henry VII., October 30, 1485; Henry VIII., June 24, 1509; Edward VI., February 20, 1546; Queen Mary, October 1, 1553; Queen Elizabeth, January 15, 1559; James I., July 25, 1603; Charles I., February 2, 1625;* Charles II., April 23, 1661; James II., April 23, 1685; William and Mary, April 11, 1689; Queen Anne, April 23, 1702; George I., October 20, 1714; George II., October 11, 1727; George III., September 22, 1761; George IV., July 19, 1821; William IV., September 8, 1831; Queen Victoria, June 28, 1838.

The last coronation doubtless still lives in the recollection of all who witnessed it. They will long remember the early summer morning, when, at break of day, the streets were crowded, and the vast city awake—the first sight of the Abbey, crowded with the mass of gorgeous spectators, themselves a pageant—the electric shock through the whole mass when the first gun announced that the Queen was on her way—and the thrill of expectation with which the iron rails seemed to tremble in the hands of the spectators, as the long procession closed with the entrance of the small figure, marked out from all beside by the regal train and attendants, floating like a crimson and silvery cloud behind her. At the moment when she first came within the full view of the Abbey, and paused, as if for breath, with clasped hands—as she moved on to her place by the altar—as in the deep silence of the vast multitude the tremulous voice of Archbishop Howley could be faintly heard, even to the remotest corners of the choir, asking for the recognition—as she sat immovable on the throne, when the crown touched her head, amid shout and trumpet and the roar of cannon—there must have been many who felt a hope that the loyalty which had

* Oliver Cromwell was enthroned as Lord Protector, not in the Abbey, but in the adjacent hall, June 26, 1657, the famous chair of Scotland being taken out of the Abbey for the purpose.

waxed cold in the preceding reigns would once more revive, in a more serious form than it had, perhaps, ever worn before. Other solemnities they may have seen more beautiful, or more strange, or more touching, but none at once so gorgeous and so impressive; in recollections, in actual sight, and in promise of what was to be.—Pp. 110, 111.

With this fairy vision ends for us the series of the most continuous succession of events that the Abbey has witnessed. None such belongs to any other building in the world. The coronation of the kings of France at Reims, and of the popes in the Basilica of the Vatican, most nearly approach it. But Reims is now deserted, and the present church of St. Peter is by five centuries more modern than the Abbey. The Westminster coronations are thus the outward expression of the grandeur of the English monarchy. They serve to mark the various turns in the winding road along which it has passed to its present form. They reflect the various proportions in which its elective and its hereditary character have counterbalanced each other. They contain, on the one hand, in the Recognition, the Enthronization, and the oath, the utterances of the "fierce democracy" of the people of England. They contain, on the other hand, in the Unction, the Crown, the Fatal Stone, in the sanction of the prelates and the homage of the nobles, the primitive regard for sacred places, sacred relics, consecrated persons, and heaven-descended rights, lingering on through all the counteracting tendencies of change and time."—Pp. 111, 112.

Every one who has visited Westminster Abbey has seen the famous coronation chair inclosing the still more famous Stone of Scone. This stone was formerly in the capital of the Scottish kingdom, and with it, at least as early as the fourteenth century, was connected the following legend:

The stony pillow on which Jacob slept at Bethel was by his countrymen transported to Egypt. Thither came Gathelus, son of Cecrops, king of Athens, and married Scota, daughter of Pharaoh. He and his Egyptian wife, alarmed at the fame of Moses, fled with the stone to Sicily or to Spain. From Spain it was carried to Ireland. On the sacred hill of Tara it became "Lia Fail," the "Stone of Destiny." On it the kings of Ireland were placed. If the chief was a true successor, the stone was silent; if a pretender, it groaned aloud as with thunder. Fergus, the founder of the Scottish monarchy, bore the sacred stone across the sea from Ireland to Dunstaffnage. In the vaults of Dunstaffnage Castle a hole is still shown where it is said to have been laid. With the migration of the Scots eastward the stone was moved by Kenneth II. (A. D. 840) and planted on a raised plot of ground at Scone, "because that the last battle with the Picts was there fought." It was there encased in a chair of

wood and stood by a cross on the east of the monastic cemetery, on or beside the Mount of Belief, which still exists. In it, or upon it, the kings of Scotland were placed by the Earls of Fife. From it Scone became the *sedes principalis* of Scotland, and the kingdom of Scotland the kingdom of Scone; and hence, for many generations Perth, and not Edinburgh, was regarded as the capital city of Scotland.

On this precious relic Edward I. fixed his hold. On it he himself was crowned king of the Scots. Westminster was to be an English Scone. It was his latest care for the Abbey. In that last year of Edward's reign [1307] the venerable chair, which still incloses it, was made for it by the order of its captor; the fragment of the world-old Celtic races was embedded in the new Plantagenet oak. The king had originally intended the seat to have been of bronze, and the workman, Adam, had actually begun it. But it was ultimately constructed of wood and decorated by Walter the painter.—Pp. 61–63.

In this chair (scratched over from top to bottom with the names of inquisitive visitors) and on this throne every English sovereign from Edward I. to Queen Victoria has been inaugurated. Once only has it been moved out of the Abbey, at the installation of Cromwell as Lord Protector. It has been called the one primeval monument which binds together the whole empire. The iron rings, the battered surface, the crack which has all but rent its solid mass asunder, bear witness to its long migrations—

> "A base, foul stone made precious by the foil
> Of England's chair." —RICHARD III., Act V, Sc. III.

Much of the interest one takes in Westminster Abbey arises from the royal tombs it contains. "The burial-places of kings are always famous." The example of Constantine, who was laid in the Church of the Apostles at Constantinople, has been followed east and west, and every European nation has now its royal consecrated cemetery. Westminster Abbey unites the coronations with the burials.

> "That antique pile behold,
> Where royal heads receive the sacred gold;
> It gives them crowns, and does their ashes keep;
> There made like gods, like mortals there they sleep;
> Making the circle of their reign complete,
> These suns of empire, where they rise they set."
> —WALLER, on St. James's Park.

The grave of Edward the Confessor drew other royal sepulchers around it. The custom, however, grew but slowly, and

has not been universal. The Conqueror was buried at Caen, William Rufus at Winchester, Henry I. at Reading, Henry II. and Richard I. at Fontevrault, John at Worcester, and others elsewhere. Henry III. (1216–1272) rebuilt and beautified the Abbey. At his coronation he dedicated the "Lady Chapel," built at the eastern end of the Abbey, a prolongation of the building, "a new place of honor behind the altar."

This king was distinguished for a passionate addiction to art in all its forms, and was greatly influenced by what he saw in his visits to France. He determined to make his new church (he went so far as to tear down the venerable pile consecrated by the recollections of the Confessor and the Conqueror) incomparable for beauty.

On it foreign painters and sculptors were invited to expend their utmost skill. "Peter the Roman citizen" was set at work on the shrine, where his name can still be read. The mosaics were from Rome. Mosaics and enamel were combined throughout in a union found nowhere else in England.

The king's extravagance is seen in the fact that he expended half a million pounds sterling on the edifice. The sums making up this amount were appropriated from high quarters and low "with desperate avidity."

The enormous exactions have left their lasting traces on the English constitution in no less a monument than the House of Commons, which rose into existence as a protest against the king's lavish expenditure on the mighty Abbey which it confronts.

In the center of this richly ornamented structure was erected the costly shrine of the Confessor, which remains to the present. To this spot, on the 13th of October, 1269, the corpse of Edward was translated with great pomp. Henry, during the fifty or more years of his reign, had seen the new Abbey arise in all its beauty, and decided that it should be the sepulcher of himself and the whole Plantagenet race. He died November 16, 1272, and was buried four days later, his body being laid in the empty coffin of the Confessor; ten years later his body was placed in the tomb built meanwhile out of the precious marbles and slabs of porphyry brought from the East by his son.

One of the most noticeable tombs is that of Henry V., whose funeral, grand beyond description, occurred November

7, 1422. For the erection of his chantry a new chapel sprang up, growing out of that of St. Edward and almost reaching the dignity of another Lady Chapel.

High above his tomb were hung his large emblazoned shield, his saddle, and his helmet, where they still remain. The saddle is that on which he

> "'Vaulted with such ease into his seat
> As if an angel dropped down from the clouds
> To witch the world with noble horsemanship.'"
> —HENRY V., Act IV, Sc. I.

The helmet is in all probability "that very casque that did affright the air at Agincourt," which twice saved his life on that eventful day—still showing in its dints the marks of the ponderous sword of the Duke of Alençon—"the bruised helmet" which he refused to have borne in state before him on his triumphal entry into London "for that he would have the praise chiefly given to God"—

> "'Being free from vainness and self-glorious pride,
> Giving full trophy, signal and ostent,
> Quite from himself to God.'" —HENRY V., Act V, Cho.

The chapel of Henry VII. occupies the extreme eastern part of the Abbey. It is a magnificent structure, built in the French style. The king's pride in its grandeur was commemorated by the ship, vast for those times, which he built "of equal cost with his chapel," which afterward, in the reign of Mary, "sank in the sea and vanished in a moment." The chapel was begun January 24, 1503, and was about completed at his death, May 9, 1509. Round his tomb stand his ten accustomed avours or guardian saints, St. Michael, St. John the Baptist, St. John the Evangelist, St. George, St. Anthony, St. Edward, St. Vincent, St. Anne, St. Mary Magdalene, and St. Barbara, as ordered in his will. Bacon, his historian, says:

So he lieth buried at Westminster, in one of the stateliest and daintiest monuments of Europe, both for the chapel and the sepulcher. So that he dwelleth more richly dead in the monument of his tomb than he did alive in Richmond or any of his palaces.

Along the sides of this old chapel are hung the faded banners which once belonged to the Knights of the Bath, a title which first appears as a distinctive name in the time of Henry V. The knights were bathed in the prince's chamber and kept their vigil in Henry VII.'s chapel, where also the installations took place; they continued until 1812, since which time

they have ceased. In 1839 the order underwent so extensive an enlargement that no banners have since been added to those then hung in the chapel. Under the banners are the knights' stalls.

Queen Elizabeth died in Richmond Palace March 24, 1603. Her body was brought by the Thames to Westminster April 28.

> "The queen did come by water to Whitehall,
> The oars at every stroke did tears let fall."

She was buried in Henry VII.'s chapel by the unmarked grave of her unfortunate predecessor.

At the head of the monument raised by her successor over the narrow vault are to be read two lines full of a far deeper feeling than we should naturally have ascribed to him—"*Regno consortes et urna, hic obdormimus Elizabetha et Maria sorores in spe resurrectionis?*" The long war of the English Reformation is closed in those words. In that contracted sepulcher, admitting of none other but those two, the stately coffin of Elizabeth rests on the coffin of Mary. The sisters are at one; the daughter of Catherine of Aragon and the daughter of Anne Boleyn repose in peace at last.—P. 181.

Strange to say, the tomb of no less a personage than James I. was unknown until 1869. The attention of Dean Stanley had been called to the conflicting accounts as found in the printed statements, and with the concurrence of the proper authorities he instituted a careful search, and after a number of disappointments succeeded in finding the resting-place of the king. The printed accounts of James's interment were found entirely at fault, and the accuracy of the Abbey Register was curiously confirmed. The coffin was found in the tomb of Henry VII., along with those of this king and his queen.

Apart from his immediate and glorious predecessor—apart from his mother, then lying in her almost empty vault with his eldest son—apart from his two beloved infant daughters—apart from his queen, who lies alone in her ample vault as if waiting for her husband to fill the vacant space—the first Stuart king, who united England and Scotland, was laid in the venerable cavern, for such in effect it is, which contained the remains of the first Tudor king, who, with his queen, had united the two contending factions of English history.—P. 684, (Appendix.)

The last king buried in the Abbey was George II., whose funeral (described by Horace Walpole) occurred November 11, 1760. The latest royal interments have been at Windsor.

The chapter on the "Monuments" is introduced by the lines of Tickell—among the best of the many which the suggestive place has called forth:

"Oft let me range the gloomy aisles alone,
Sad luxury! To vulgar minds unknown,
Along the walls where speaking marbles show
What worthies form the hallowed mold below;
Proud names, who once the reins of empire held,
In arms who triumphed, or in arts excelled;
Chiefs graced with scars and prodigal of blood;
Stern patriots, who for sacred freedom stood;
Just men, by whom impartial laws were given;
And saints who taught, and led the way to heaven."

Of all the characteristics of Westminster Abbey, that which most endears it to the nation and gives most force to its name is that it is the resting-place of famous Englishmen from every rank and creed and every form of mind and genius.

It is this aspect which, more than any other, won for it the delightful visits of Addison in the "Spectator," of Steele in the "Tattler," of Goldsmith in the "Citizen of the World," of Charles Lamb in "Elia," of Washington Irving in the "Sketch Book." It is this which inspired the saying of Nelson, "Victory or Westminster Abbey!" and which has intertwined it with so many eloquent passages of Macaulay. Kings are no longer buried within its walls; even the splendor of pageants has ceased to attract; but the desire to be interred in Westminster Abbey is still as strong as ever.—Pp. 207, 208.

The many monuments, too numerous to be even enumerated here, are grouped and described by our author as follows: Courtiers of various kings and queens; magnates of the commonwealth; chiefs of the Reformation; heroes of the Dutch war, the revolution of 1688, etc.; statesmen of the house of Hanover; soldiers; sailors; heroes of American and Indian wars; modern statesmen; Indian statesmen; philanthropists; poets; historians; theologians; men of letters; actors; musicians; artists; men of science; physicians; the nobility. We must content ourselves with a brief mention of a few of the names found in the southern transept or "Poets' Corner." Washington Irving speaks for all his countrymen when he says:

I have always observed that the visitors to the Abbey remain longest about the simple memorials in Poets' Corner. A kinder and fonder feeling takes the place of that cold curiosity

or vague admiration with which they gaze on the splendid monuments of the great and the heroic. They linger about these as about the tombs of friends and companions.*

The great Chaucer died (October 25, 1400) in a house standing on what is now a part of the Abbey; among his last utterances were the pathetic words—

> "Here is no home—here is but wilderness,
> Forth, pilgrim; forth, O, beast, out of thy stall!
> Look up on high, and thank thy God of all.
> Control thy lust; and let thy spirit thee lead;
> And Truth thee shall deliver; 'tis no dread."

Royal favor secured for him a resting-place in the Abbey. It was not till the reign of Edward VI. that the present tomb was raised, (1551.)

Spenser, who died January 16, 1599, lies near Chaucer.

His hearse was attended by poets, and mournful elegies and poems, with the pens that wrote them, were thrown into his tomb. What a funeral was that at which Beaumont, Fletcher, Jonson, and in all probability Shakespeare, attended! What a grave in which the pen of Shakespeare may be molding away!

Beaumont also lies near Chaucer. He died March 9, 1615. A year later, April 23, 1616, Shakespeare died; owing, no doubt, to the imperfect recognition of his genius, he was buried at Stratford, where he still lies; his beautiful monument in the Abbey, with its appropriate inscription from the "Tempest," was erected in 1740. Ben Jonson, "the first unquestionable laureate," soon followed; he died August 16, 1637. According to the local tradition, he asked the king (Charles I.) to grant him a favor. "What is it?" said the king. "Give me eighteen inches of square ground." "Where?" asked the king. "In Westminster Abbey." This is one explanation given of the story that he was buried standing upright. Another is that it was with a view to his readiness for the resurrection. He lies buried in the north aisle, in the path of square stone opposite to the scutcheon of Robertus De Ros, with this inscription only on him, in a pavement-square of blue marble, about fourteen inches square,

O RARE BEN JONSON!

"which was done at the charge of Jack Young, (afterward

* "Sketch Book," p. 216.

knighted,) who, walking there when the grave was covering, gave the fellow eighteen-pence to cut it."

Goldsmith, who died April 4, 1774, was buried at the Temple. "I remember once," said Dr. Johnson, "being with Goldsmith in Westminster Abbey. While we surveyed the Poets' Corner I said to him, '*Forsitan et nostrum nomen miscebitur istis.*' When we got to Temple Bar he stopped me, pointed to the heads [of the Jacobites] upon it and slyly whispered me, '*Forsitan et nostrum nomen miscebiter istis.*'"

Goldsmith's monument is on the south wall of the south transept in a situation selected by Sir Joshua Reynolds and with the well known Latin inscription composed by Dr. Johnson, who denied even the famous round-robin of his friends asking that the epitaph might be in English rather than in Latin.

The whole inscription shows the supreme position which Goldsmith occupied in English literature; and one expression, at least, has passed from it into the proverbial Latin of mankind—*Nihil tetigit quod non ornavit.*

Goldsmith was soon followed by Johnson.

A few days before his death (December 13, 1784) he asked Sir John Hawkins, one of his executors, where he should be buried; and on being answered, "Doubtless in Westminster Abbey," seemed to feel a satisfaction very natural to a poet, and indeed very natural to every man of any imagination who has no family sepulcher in which he can be laid with his fathers.

A flag-stone with the name of Johnson and the date alone marks the spot, (near the Shakespeare monument.) The monument long intended to be placed on it was at last transferred to St. Paul's.

The vacillating character of public opinion is well illustrated in the case of Milton. His death occurred in 1674. Thirty years later, in 1708, John Philips, confessedly an imitator of the great poet, died and was buried in the Abbey. The partial patron who composed the inscription on his tomb declared that in the field of blank verse he was second to Milton *alone:* "*Uni Miltono secundus, primoque pone par.*" The words were obliterated, as the Royalist Dean would not allow the name of "the regicide Milton" to be engraved on the walls of the Abbey. Four years later, when Atterbury was Dean, the excommunication was removed and the obnoxious lines

admitted. Another four years later "the irresistible feeling of admiration growing in every English heart" found free expression. "Such was the change of public opinion," said Dr. Gregory to Dr. Johnson, "that I have seen erected in the church a bust of that man whose name I once knew considered as a pollution of its walls." "It is, indeed," says Dean Stanley, "a triumph of the force of truth and genius such as of itself hallows the place which has witnessed it."

Another illustration of the tardy recognition of real worth and greatness is seen in the memorial tablet so recently erected to John and Charles Wesley, whose brief inscription will be read with appreciative hearts by others as well as Methodist visitors to this famous shrine. It may not be generally known that the Wesleys were connected with the great Abbey. Dean Stanley tells us that

> Samuel Wesley, elder brother of John and Charles, who inherited his mother's strong Jacobite tendencies, was attracted to a mastership at Westminster by his friendship for Atterbury; and in his house was nurtured his brother Charles, "the sweet psalmist" of the Church of those days, who went from thence as a Westminster student to Christ Church.

If ever hero deserved interment within these royal walls it was he whose embalmed body was brought a short yesterday ago from beyond the sea and placed here—the immortal Livingstone, "missionary, philanthropist, explorer." As one stands above the grave and reads the well-worded inscription on the stone he cannot but feel the inspiration that comes from the study of the life of a great, unselfish man.

As we stroll through the Poets' Corner and think of the greatest geniuses who have followed in the steps of Chaucer we miss several of the most famous. Pope is not here. It was his own wish (as expressed in his epitaph) to be interred by his mother's side in the parish church of Twickenham. Of a later date, Burns sleeps at Dumfries, Sir Walter Scott at Dryburgh; Byron lies at Newstead. "We cannot even now retrace the close of the brilliant and miserable career of the most celebrated Englishman of the nineteenth century," says Macaulay, "without feeling something of what was felt by those who saw the hearse, with its long train of carriages, turn slowly northward, leaving behind it that cemetery which had

been consecrated by the dust of so many great poets, but of which the doors were closed against all that remained of Byron." It was understood that an unfavorable answer would be given to any application to inter Byron in the Abbey.

The monuments to actors bring us to a subject where opinions certainly differ. In France—not over-religious, surely—Christian burial was denied to actors unless they repudiated their profession; but the Church of England, following the example of Rome, has shown greater liberality of opinion, and Westminster Abbey is the crowning scene of this triumph of the stage. "Not only has it included under its walls the memorials of the greatest of dramatists, and also those whose morality is the most obnoxious to complaint, but it has opened its doors to the whole race of illustrious actors and actresses." We are not surprised to read that a protest was raised against the epitaph of Shadwell, and also against the monument of Anne Oldfield, (buried in the Abbey October 27, 1730.) Graves like hers and that of Congreve seem sadly out of place in the sacred mausoleum. On visiting Garrick's monument, even Charles Lamb, "the gentlest and most genial of mortals," was constrained to say:

> Though I would not go so far, with some good Catholics abroad, as to shut players altogether out of consecrated ground, yet I own I was a little scandalized at the introduction of theatrical airs and gestures into a place set apart to remind us of the saddest realities. Going nearer, I found inscribed under this harlequin figure a farrago of false thoughts and nonsense.

Dean Stanley's remarks on this subject are so characteristic that they deserve a place here:

> Courayer, the foreign latitudinarian, Ephraim Chambers, the skeptic of the humbler, and Sheffield, of the higher ranks, were buried with all respect and honor by the "College of Priests" at Westminster, who thus acknowledged that the bruised reed was not to be broken nor the smoking flax quenched. Even the yet harder problem of high intellectual gifts united with moral infirmity or depravity has, on the whole, here met with the only solution which on earth can be given. If Byron was turned from our doors, many a one as questionable as Byron has been admitted. Close above the monument of the devoted Granville Sharpe is the monument of the epicurean St. Evremond. Close beneath the tablet of the blameless Wharton lies the licentious Congreve. The godlike gift of genius was recognized—the baser earthly

part was left to the merciful judgment of its Creator. So long as Westminster Abbey maintains its hold on the affections of the English Church and nation, so long will it remain a standing proof that there is in the truest feelings of human nature, and in the noblest aspirations of religion, something deeper and broader than the partial judgments of the day and the technical distinctions of sects—even than the just though, for the moment, misplaced indignation against the errors and sins of our brethren. It is the involuntary homage which perverted genius pays to the superior worth of goodness that it seeks to be at least honored within the building consecrated to the purest hopes of the soul of man; and when we consent to receive such within our walls it is the best acknowledgment of the truth uttered by the Christian poet:

> "There is no light but thine,
> With thee all beauty glows."

The oft-quoted words of Addison very naturally suggest themselves to one as he walks through those consecrated aisles and looks upon the numerous monuments:

When I am in a serious humor I very often walk by myself in Westminster Abbey; where the gloominess of the place, and the use to which it is applied, with the solemnity of the building, and the condition of the people who lie in it, are apt to fill the mind with a kind of melancholy, or rather thoughtfulness, that is not disagreeable. . . . I know that entertainments of this nature are apt to raise dark and dismal thoughts in timorous minds and gloomy imaginations; but for my own part, though I am always serious, I do not know what it is to be melancholy; and can therefore take a view of nature in her deep and solemn scenes with the same pleasure as in her most gay and delightful ones. By this means I can improve myself with those objects which others consider with terror. When I look upon the tombs of the great, every emotion of envy dies in me; when I read the epitaphs of the beautiful, every inordinate desire grows out; when I meet with the grief of parents upon a tombstone, my heart melts with compassion; when I see the tomb of the parents themselves, I consider the vanity of grieving for those whom we must quickly follow; when I see kings lying by those who deposed them, when I consider rival wits placed side by side, or the holy men that divided the world with their contests and disputes, I reflect with sorrow and astonishment on the little competitions, factions, and debates of mankind. When I read the several dates of the tombs, of some that died yesterday and some six hundred years ago, I consider that great day when we shall all of us be contemporaries and make our appearance together.*

Westminster Abbey is above eulogistic phrases. Its future will, no doubt, be at least holier than its past. We can most

* "Spectator," No. 26.

heartily agree with Dean Stanley in the concluding utterances of the work before us:

Not surely in vain did the architects of successive generations raise this consecrated edifice in its vast and delicate proportions, more keenly appreciated in this our day than in any other since it first was built; designed, if ever were any forms on earth, to lift the soul heavenward to things unseen. Not surely in vain has our English language grown to meet the highest ends of devotion with a force which the rude native dialect and barbaric Latin of the Confessor's age could never attain. Not surely for idle waste has a whole world of sacred music been created which no ear of Norman or Plantagenet ever heard, nor skill of Saxon harper or Celtic minstrel ever conceived. Not surely for nothing has the knowledge of the will of God almost steadily increased century by century, through the better understanding of the Bible, of history, and of nature. Not surely in vain has the heart of man kept its freshness while the world has been waxing old, and the most restless and inquiring intellects cling to the belief that "the everlasting arms are still beneath us," and that "prayer is the potent inner supplement of man's outward life." Here, if anywhere, the Christian worship of England may labor to meet both the strength and the weakness of succeeding ages; to inspire new meaning into ancient forms, and embrace within itself each rising aspiration after all greatness, human and divine.

So considered, so used, the Abbey of Westminster may become more and more a witness to that one Sovereign Good, to that one Supreme Truth—a shadow of a great rock in a weary land, a haven of rest in this tumultuous world, a breakwater for the waves upon waves of human hearts and souls which beat unceasingly around its island shores.—P. 583.

Art. V.—RUSSIA AND ENGLAND IN CENTRAL ASIA.

The Territorial Expansion of Russia. By D. Mackenzie Wallace. "The Fortnightly Review," 1876.

Afghanistan. By A. G. Constable. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Account of Persia. By James B. Fraser. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Story of the Merv. By Edmond O'Donovan. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 1884.

No event is insignificant, for every event has its relations, and is a link in the extended chain of human progress. Things comparatively trivial have their bearing on the question of the world's civilization. The common interest of all men in what concerns any portion of the race is a demonstrable fact. The cannon discharged in the mountain-passes of Central Asia send

their reverberations into all lands. The dominancy, in the strongholds of the East, of Saxon or Cossack, of Christian or Mussulman, is a matter which concerns us and our children, and all the coming generations of men.

The submission of the tribes of Merv to Russia may not seem, at first view, to be an affair of very great importance. If Turcomania has really become a part of the great growing empire of Russia, it may not be immediately manifest how the interests of civilization will be affected. But Russia, the territorial neighbor of England—Russia, on the very borders of India—Russia, holding the strong mountain districts which command, in a military sense, the rich provinces of Hindustan—Russia, allying to herself the warlike tribes of Central Asia—this may mean a fierce contest of arms, involving the great powers of Europe, determining the course of future events, and helping or hindering the happiness of mankind. O'Donovan, in the narrative of his thrilling adventures, describes the Merv as including the entire country occupied by the Turcoman clans known as the Merv Tekkes. The capture of Geok Tepe by the Russians occurred while O'Donovan was experiencing his honorable captivity in Turcoman. Although created a khan, and treated with marked distinction, he was, nevertheless, held as a prisoner, and was only released in accordance with the peremptory demand of the British minister at Teheran, the Persian capital. The reason seemed to be, that the Mervs feared subjugation by the Russians, and were really anxious to secure the protection of England. "The Turcomans entertained the belief," says O'Donovan, "that British troops would speedily march, *via* Herat to Merv, if they were not already on the way." But, at that very time, the English were preparing to evacuate Candahar, and to leave not only the Tekkes, but also the Afghans, to such fortune as might come to them from Russian diplomacy and arms. The Merv chiefs were ready enough to fight against Ayoub Khan, if permitted to do so under the English banner, and, indeed, they formally proffered their allegiance to the British Queen; but the English embassador at the Persian court, while thanking them for their kindly sentiments, said: "It is my duty, however, to state to you, with reference to the proffer of allegiance to the British government, that the proposal that the people of Merv should

become British subjects is one that, owing to various causes, physical as well as political, cannot be entertained." The English policy left Russia at liberty to prosecute her ambitious designs unobstructed, and recent events certainly do not surprise those who have carefully observed the drift of affairs. The Russian eagles are now on the borders of Afghanistan, which country is separated from Turkistan only by the Paropamisan Mountains, and by the Hindoo-Coosh—a crest of the Himalaya range. The Jelum and the Indus Rivers formerly divided Afghanistan from India, but the acquisition of Scinde and Punjaub carried the line of British dominion westward, nearly to the base of the Solyman Mountains. It is plain, therefore, that the place to defend Calcutta, Delhi, and Bombay is not on the banks of the Indus, but in the impregnable mountain-passes of the Hindoo-Coosh. The practical extension of the Russian frontier makes the question of the political or governmental control of the powerless states of Central Asia, as well as the question of the future of the British Empire in India, a living question, demanding immediate consideration, and one which is of transcendent importance to the Old World and the New. English occupation in Hindustan has been a steady advance from the South toward this disputed border-land; in the meantime, Russia has as steadily moved down from the North. Constable said, in 1879:

> The Russian journals of recent date make no secret of Kaufmann's intention to occupy the oasis of Merv, if he can reach it. Once at Merv, which is within ten easy marches of Herat, the Russians are in possession of a base from which they might, with comparative security and a reasonable chance of success, operate against Afghanistan, and, in the event of a failure on the part of the English to prepare for such a contingency, even against India itself. Whether the Russian policy is really antagonistic to the English rule in India or not, it is, as I have said, impossible for the Indian government to shut its eyes to the possibilities of a Russian, Persian, Turcoman, and Usbeg force marching on Herat.

Russia has control of the Caspian Sea, the Aral Sea, and the river Oxus. She dictates the policy of the Persian court, and she has a faithful ally in the Emir of Bokhara. The victories of Kaufmann have not only secured to her important strategical positions in Turkistan, but have also opened her way to the very gates of Afghanistan. If she can secure

Herat or Cabul, or even a protectorate over the territory of the latter, she has reached the north-western boundary of India, and holds in her hands the keys of the East. Herat is a point of great importance. It is a frontier town between Persia and Afghanistan, and it is connected by high-roads with the capitals of all the surrounding countries. Every invasion of India has been by the way of the Bolan Pass, southward of Herat, on to the plains of the Indus. The Persian siege of Herat, in 1838, as was well understood in India, was encouraged by Russia. It is even certain that Russian officers assisted the Persians in the siege. More than a score of times have pillaging armies, seeking not only conquest, but plunder, swept down upon India through the defiles of Afghanistan.

"Where then," inquires Constable, "is the strategical frontier of British India?" "I think," he answers, "the English are about to settle this by the permanent occupation of the interior of these famous passes." If, for the last fifty years, Russian officers in Central Asia have coveted the wealth and warmth, the rich harvests and the richer cities of India, is it any marvel that in England, and especially among British residents in India, there has been a growing determination that, cost what it may, the Cossacks shall remain on the northern slopes of the Hindoo-Coosh? The Russian advancement and interference have been constant. The English general, Rob erts, in an official report, confirms the suspicion that Russian or other foreign officers assisted Ayoub Khan, when in arms against British authority. The necessity of a permanent English protectorate in Afghanistan becomes more manifest every hour. It was said, when Gen. Burrows was defeated, with the loss of two thousand European troops and a large India contingent, and the expenditure of twenty millions sterling, that it was paying "a high price for a scientific frontier."

One might answer this in the language of D. Mackenzie Wallace, in "The Fortnightly Review:"

> The idea of a central zone between the Russian and British frontiers in Asia is an absurdity, fit only to amuse diplomatists, and unworthy of being entertained by practical statesmen, unless, indeed, it were possible to find a broad uninhabited zone which would serve the same purpose as the great wall of China. If it be habitable, it will inevitably become an asylum for all the robbers and lawless spirits within a radius of many hundred miles,

and no civilized power can reasonably be expected to accept such neighbors. If such a zone had been established, Russia might justly have spoken to England in this fashion: "I object to have at my doors this refuge for rascality. Either you must preserve order among the inmates or allow me to do so." . . . Russia must push forward her frontier until she reaches a country possessing a government which is able and willing to keep order within its borders, and to prevent its subjects from committing depredations on their neighbors. As none of the petty states of Central Asia seems capable of permanently fulfilling this condition, it is pretty certain that the Russian and British frontiers will one day meet. Where they will meet depends upon ourselves. If we do not wish her to overstep a certain line, we must ourselves advance to that line.

This reasoning is entirely conclusive, and in perfect harmony with the facts.

Many persons seem to think that this question of the presence and influence of a great European power in Afghanistan is a recent question. On the contrary, it is as old as the century, and every far-seeing statesman for at least two generations, having knowledge of affairs in the East, has realized its existence and importance. In 1809 Napoleon sent Gen. Gardanné to Persia in the hope of inducing the Shah to invade India; and the Indian government, at about the same time, sent a representative to the court of Shah Soojah, in Afghanistan, to create an opposition to Persia. A mission was also sent to the Persian court, and an alliance, offensive and defensive, was actually entered into by the Persian and British governments. It is well known that Napoleon regarded India as England's vulnerable point, and that he cherished an ambition of rivaling the fame of Alexander by a triumphant march through the East. But Wellington settled that little matter on the field of Waterloo, and there was no longer any danger to India from the diplomacy or arms of France.

Then arose the dark shadow of Russian aggression. "The annexation of Georgia to the empire of the Czar," as Constable says, "brought the eagles of Russia to the frontiers of Persia." Since that day, no English statesman has been indifferent to the affairs of Central Asia. They are germinant with empire, and they contain, in embryo, what must seriously affect the great future of the race. The Russian policy has been a constant quantity; her diplomacy and arms have borne

her victorious standards steadily forward toward the shores of the Indian Ocean. But English operations, especially in Afghanistan, which is really the key to the situation, have ebbed and flowed with the waves of partisan politics at home. Vast sums have been expended, and thousands of precious lives sacrificed, for no valuable result. The prediction of Constable has not been fulfilled. "The permanent occupation of the interior of the famous passes," in Afghanistan, which are the natural and well-nigh impregnable defenses of the British Empire in India, has not been realized. If a contrary policy had been pursued—if Candahar and Cabul and Herat, and the adjacent provinces, had been taken under British protection—if the English flag had been boldly planted on the summits of the Hindoo-Coosh—an alliance might have been formed with the Turcomans which would have secured to England, in case of necessity, a hundred thousand mounted troops, and which would have arrested the advance of the Russian eagles on the shores of the Caspian or the banks of the Oxus. But the cry of "Jingoism" and the clamors of the rate-payers weakened the hands of the government. What had been secured was relinquished. And yet in the disastrous hour of Gen. Burrows's defeat, when it was persistently asked, "Why was an English army in Afghanistan to be slaughtered?" it might have been triumphantly answered: The army was there as the representative of the English name and power; it was there as the defender of the empire of India, with its one hundred thousand European residents and as many more Eurasians; with its nine hundred and fifty thousand square miles of territory and its one hundred and ninety millions of people, to say nothing of dependencies; with its two hundred millions of dollars of annual revenue, all of which and more is expended in India for the improvement and elevation of the country and its inhabitants; with its paid-up railway capital of four hundred and twenty-five millions of dollars, represented by five thousand miles of trunk railway, linking together such distant and important points as Madras, Bombay, Calcutta, and Lahore; with its nearly two thousand miles of irrigating canals and other works of irrigation, to prevent or to mitigate famine; and with its fifteen thousand miles of land and marine telegraph, bringing every part of the eastern

British Empire within twelve hours of speaking distance of London. It was there because, as the Russian frontier advances, the area for British commerce diminishes; it was there to prevent Russian custom-houses, with their protective tariffs, from being established within gun-shot of British sentries on the Indus; it was there as the pioneer of Anglo-Saxon ideas, books, enginery, printing-presses, locomotives, telegraphs, schools, churches, and all the practical benefits of the richest material and spiritual civilization on the globe; it was there to command peace among warring tribes, and, soon or later, to secure it, and to bring to all of them impartially the blessings of law, order, and stability; it was there to guard those mountain defiles through which every invading army has come, on its errand of robbery and murder, into the rich lands and cities of India; it was there because of the right of self-preservation, and because England stands before the world as the protector of two hundred and fifty millions of Orientals whom she is bound to defend against spoliation and ruin; it was there in the interest of nearly two millions of Christians occupying British Asia, and intensely concerned in the permanence and power of England's empire in the East; it was there, finally, because the invasion of Afghanistan was required by British policy in Asia, and because the prestige of the British Empire must be preserved or the evacuation of India must follow.

The wisdom of the British diplomacy, the prowess of the British army, the weight and majesty of the British government, must be maintained in Afghanistan, and must be demonstrated to all fanatical Moslems, and to all intriguing adherents of Russia, and to all the native races south of the Himalayas, or the pillars of Britain's empire in the East will be wrenched from their foundation, and the whole magnificent structure she has reared be reduced to a hopeless ruin.

The evacuation of India, at the bidding of Mohammedan or Cossack, would be the permanent humiliation of England, an irreparable misfortune to two hundred and fifty millions of Moslems and Hindus, and a serious disaster to the civilized world. It would so effectually arrest and turn back the tide of Christian advancement and of human progress that centuries would not witness the reflow and the recovery of what had

been lost. It would stagnate the world's commerce and send financial wreck and ruin into every realm of trade. On the fair missionary morning of the world's redemption and millennial glory it would cast the midnight blackness of despair and death. England's Queen is also India's Empress, and Great Britain is bound to devote her last shilling and her last soldier before that diadem is snatched from Victoria's brow.

England and Russia face each other in the passes and on the mountain-ranges of Afghanistan. It is an Anglo-Saxon or a Cossack victory which is to be achieved. It is a contest, not only for empire and national supremacy, but for civilization, for liberty, for the future of the race. It is a deadly grip betwixt Protestantism and the Greek Church, betwixt liberal forms of government and a crushing despotism, betwixt an open field for missionary activities and the withering blight of Nihilism. The best hopes of man, for the best possible future of the race, shine, with growing brightness, in the advance and triumph of the English arms. If English power and English law become predominant and permanent in Afghanistan, the missionary and the Bible will follow; all the rich fruits of material progress will be reaped by all the people of that land; churches and schools will be established, roads and bridges will be constructed, and, although the great mass of the present generation may die in the faith of Islam, the Gospel leaven will ultimately accomplish its work and produce a nobler and more beneficent type of social and religious life. Christian civilization advances with the flag of every great Protestant power; and if England shall become as securely intrenched in Afghanistan as she is in India, kindred results of Gospel teaching and triumph will be developed. English predominance in Afghanistan will make an end of the wars of upstart princes and contending factions; will emancipate woman from a tyranny greater than that of the sword, and give her equal rights in the school and in the church, and will secure to labor its just and honorable fruits—the accumulation of property and its undisturbed possession. "Intellectual and moral power," says Bishop Edward Thomson, "has both rights and responsibilities, and is destined to rule the earth under the providence of God." He argues that pagan and Mohammedan peoples "may do wrongs which may justify superior nations in exercising

power over them," and this exercise of power may improve their condition and promote all their best interests. There can be no dispute that British authority in India, while it has despoiled, sometimes unjustly and cruelly, native princes, has nevertheless emancipated the oppressed peoples, abolished hurtful superstitions, and greatly benefited the masses. "What would it advantage the peoples of Hindustan," asks Constable, "to change English for Russian rule? The Russians govern with the iron hand of military power. The English government of India is based on civil law, right, and justice, although sustained by mighty strength." He argues that the great feudal chiefs of India, Hindu and Mussulman, understand the difference between English and Russian rule, and concludes as follows: "With our knowledge of the facility with which Russia could, in alliance with Persia and the Afghans, enter the plains of India, surely we may concede that it is the paramount duty of England to take every precaution against such a result." Not only Persians and Afghans will be rallied under the Russian banner, but Turcomans also, who, as we have seen, offered their allegiance to England and were repulsed. Constable says:

> These Tekkes are the most warlike of the Turcoman race, and are settled, if a nomadic people can ever be called settled, along the river Attruck and the skirts of the hills from the Caspian to the Merv. They number sixty thousand tents, or—five persons to a tent—three hundred thousand souls. If they are brought under the influence of Russia they, with the Salor and Saruk tribes, could readily furnish a force of fifty thousand men, which, under Russian officers, would be the most formidable light cavalry in the world.

O'Donovan describes the Tekkes as splendid horsemen and fearless fighters, delighting in raids and contests of arms.

There is another element entering into this problem of empire in the East which is of stupendous importance, and that is, the religious element. It is not merely a contest betwixt the Greek Church and Protestantism, or betwixt Christianity and paganism. In religion the Afghans and the Turcomans are Mohammedans, and are intensely superstitious and bigoted. Russia does not seek to impose on her subjects in Central Asia the forms of the Greek Church. The Crescent and the Cross seem to be equally in favor with the government. No spirit

of propagandism is manifested by the adherents of the State Church. In this particular Russia has an advantage in the fierce struggle for dominion; for British authority, established in any land, is certain to be followed by Protestant teaching and the spirit and work of evangelism. It is reasonable to expect that the followers of the False Prophet will be easily stirred to vindictive opposition in the presence of an earnest Christian faith, and of persistent missionary labors. Islam, in the East, it is claimed, is tolerant of Parsees and Christians; but that is only in so far as Parsees and Christians do not interfere with the doctrine and worship of Mohammedanism. That the Turcomans and Afghans, and many of the dwellers in India, are Mussulmans, is a fact which must not be overlooked, or treated as of inferior importance, when we consider the gigantic forces which are to shape the future of Asiatic civilization.

Islam, from the beginning, has been a drama of marvel and power—splendid as a spectacle, and brilliant in achievement. One cannot contemplate without emotion that stupendous movement, embodying so much truth and so much falsehood, which, within a hundred years of the *hegira* of its great prophet, by preaching and praying and fighting, had fired its followers with the fiercest fanaticism, had made them superior to danger and death, and had converted them into such a body of invincible crusaders as the world has seldom seen. Islam—the word, though applied to a religion promulgated by fire and sword, means *to make peace*—beginning in an obscure city by the Red Sea, displaying the crescent, image of its growing power, promising paradise to the faithful, denouncing death and hell upon all unbelievers, and shouting in the ears of Christians and idolaters, "There is but one God, and Mohammed is his prophet;" arising at a period when Roman strength and glory were waning, and when there was no great, compact power to resist its advances; "more pure," as Gibbon says, "than the system of Zoroaster, more liberal than the law of Moses," and "less inconsistent with reason than the creed of mystery and superstition which, in the seventh century, disgraced the simplicity of the Gospel;" declaring, in its sacred book, that "the sword is the key of heaven and hell," that a drop of blood shed in the cause of God, a night spent in arms, is of more avail than two

months of fasting and prayer;" that "whosoever falls in battle his sins are forgiven, at the day of judgment his wounds shall be resplendent as vermilion, and odoriferous as musk," and that "the loss of his limbs shall be supplied by the wings of angels and cherubim;" teaching a doctrine of absolute fate and predestination, in accordance with which the dauntless Moslem ordained to perish in his bed, was absolutely safe and invulnerable from the darts of the enemy; summoning its followers "to freedom and victory, to arms and rapine, to the indulgence of their darling passions in this world and the other;" painting the rewards and punishments of a future life "by the images most congenial to an ignorant and carnal generation"—Islam, in a single century, had carried its victorious standards throughout Arabia, Syria, Persia, Afghanistan, and portions of India; and also through Egypt, Tunis, Tripoli, Algeria, and Morocco, to the very shores of the Atlantic, where the zealous Akbar, the Mohammedan Alexander, spurring his horse into the foaming waves, exclaimed with the enthusiasm of an apostle and with the bitterness of a fanatic, "Great God! if my course were not stopped by this sea, I would still go on to the unknown kingdoms of the West, preaching the unity of thy holy name, and putting to the sword the rebellious nations who worship any other gods than thee."

Though the armies of Islam could not cross the Atlantic, they could cross the Mediterranean, and the banner of the False Prophet was unfurled in triumph in the fairest provinces of Spain—in Andalusia, in Catalonia, in Castile, in Aragon, in Léon, and even in Asturias, in the extreme north. The Cross went down before the Crescent from the Strait of Gibraltar to the Bay of Biscay. The successes were as marked on the other side of the Pyrenees, till Charles Martel, on the banks of the Loire, in the very heart of France, gave Islam a blow which won for him the epithet "Hammer of God," stayed the proud waves of Moslem triumph, broke the spell of Mohammedan invincibility, and saved Europe and America to Christ and to Christian civilization.

In India, to-day, out of a total population of two hundred and forty-two millions, more than forty millions are Mohammedans; and in the provinces ruled by native princes, but sustained by British arms and influence, are about eight mill-

ions more. Of these forty-eight millions of Moslems thirty-six millions are distributed over northern India. On the western border, from the Himalaya Mountains to the Indian Ocean, they constitute not less than eighty per cent. of the total population. The government schools in India and the government offices are open to Mohammedans as well as to Hindus. Mohammedans form, it is said, the greater part of the Anglo-Indian army, and also of the native police. No Moslem prince, not even the Sultan of Turkey, rules over as many Mohammedans as the Protestant Queen of England and Empress of India. The followers of Islam in Afghanistan and in India, separated only by an invisible boundary line, are quickly and responsively sympathetic with each other. Can any man fail to see how profoundly this condition of things must enter into the question of the future of the British Empire in India? The successful government of the Moslem east of the Indus makes it necessary that the Moslem of Afghanistan and of Turcoman shall have a salutary respect for British power, courage, and resources. This is not a mere matter of political philosophy; historic facts demonstrate the proposition.

When Sir John Lawrence, Viceroy of India, entered on his high office in January, 1864, he found abundant proofs that the insurrection of the Sittanna fanatics, on the northwest frontier of India, had been encouraged by Mohammedan agents, who had been sent from Afghanistan to different parts of the empire to preach a holy war against the infidels. The influence of the Wahabees, a bitter fanatical Mohammedan sect who hold that it is the imperative duty of every true Mussulman to murder infidel rulers, has been steadily increasing in India for a number of years. They say that no one can be permanent master of Hindustan unless he invades it from the north; and that as the English sneaked into it from the south they will soon be driven out. It is indisputable that the Mussulmans of India are filled with a longing faith and expectation that their Imam—a prince of supreme temporal and spiritual power—is to come out of the West, to give them the government of Asia. They look with an earnest, enthusiastic hope for the flaming sign of a deliverer who shall appear on the mountain summits where the Aryans first rested on their march, to lead all those who shall be so happy

as to be there waiting for his coming to victory over the infidel here, and to sensuous delights in a promised paradise. The direct way, therefore, to keep down the Moslem turbulence in India is to subdue utterly the fierce, fanatical Mohammedans of Afghanistan and of Turkistan. It is from this quarter that the conquering leader is expected to come, and from which very possibly he may come. It is plain, then, that English predominance in Cabul, in Herat, and in Candahar, means peace, security, and social and financial prosperity in India.

"Any one who has lived on friendly terms with Mohammedans," says "The Fortnightly Review," "must have noticed that they are utterly inaccessible to the influence of Christianity. They are proud of their Mohammedanism, and look down on Christians as polytheists." It argues, therefore, that they are "pretty certain to withstand the proselyting tendencies of other faiths." But proselyting agencies are not the weapons of our warfare. The Gospel must be preached to these proud bigots as to other sinners, and with them, as with other sinners, it will prove the power of God unto salvation. Why should it not? Islam is rigidly monotheistic. It unites with Jew and Christian in proclaiming the sublime truth, before which every idolatrous system perishes, "The Lord our God is ONE LORD." It recognizes the authority of the Holy Scriptures. A Mohammedan scholar, Saiyid Ahmed Khan, Chief-Justice at Ghazipoor, on the Ganges, has made a translation of the Old and New Testaments, since both, he says, are still binding for the faith and life of Mohammedans. Rev. T. P. Hughes, missionary of the Church Missionary Society at Peshawur, says: "In Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, the conversion of a Moslem is looked upon as almost hopeless, whereas in the central provinces, and in the Punjaub, some of our best and most energetic Christians are converts from Islam." In the Syrian missions, where the missionaries are not allowed to preach openly among the Moslems, many girls have been gathered into the mission schools. Speaking of missions in Turkey and Persia, Mr. H. K. Carroll says: "Although few of the followers of the False Prophet have been reached by any of these missions, the influence of a pure and vital Christianity has had an effect upon them." So it

must be every-where. The Church is a city set on a hill, and in every land where it is established the light, soon or later, will scatter the darkness and reveal the truths of Christ's kingdom.

In some things it would seem that the Koran must prepare the way for the introduction of the Gospel. It affirms the divine presence, and demolishes idols and images. "We are only two," said the trembling Abubeker when, flying from persecution, he was with the prophet hidden in a cave. "There is a third," replied Mohammed, "it is God himself." The Koran forbids absolutely the use of wine, and enjoins prayer, fasting, and alms-giving, and insists that cleanliness is the key to prayer; and all this would be very salutary gospel for many a Christian congregation. O'Donovan states that when in Merv he was called on by a Seyd, a descendant of Mohammed, who said that he (O'Donovan) was so well acquainted with Mussulman tenets he saw no reason whatever why he should not openly embrace the true faith. Jesus and Moses were, he said, quite as much respected by the adherents of Islam as by his own co-religionists. In addition to the theological argument he offered O'Donovan the luxury of as many as four wives if he became a Mussulman. It is insisted, by a thoroughly competent observer, that, at least in Africa, "the work of Islam is preliminary and preparatory" to the introduction and triumph of the Gospel.

Christianity and Mohammedanism are the only growing, aggressive, missionary faiths, or religions, now in the world. They must yet meet in an open field, in the arena of reason and conscience, in a final and, it may be, prolonged and desperate struggle for prevalence and victory. Who can doubt the result? Or who can fail to see which side is for man, for material growth, for social well-being, for the uplifting of the race, and for the glory of God?

"No use to preach the Gospel to Mohammedans!" It is an old story, with but a slight variation. No use to preach the Gospel to Indians, to Negroes, to Hottentots, to cannibals, to savages, to bloodthirsty, dirt-eating pagans! Such have been the admonitions which the Church has received at different periods; and yet, among all these, jewels have been found for Messiah's crown. The Gospel which triumphed over the

bigoted Jew, the cultured Greek, the arrogant Roman, the brutal Goth and Vandal; which, in our day, has kindled its torch on every shore from Greenland to New Zealand; which has surrounded the continent of Africa with its blazing camp-fires; which has converted a howling wilderness into the garden of God, a very Eden of moral loveliness, in the Sandwich Islands and in Madagascar; which has conquered a continental empire for Christ in Australasia, making churches and conferences out of savages and cannibals; which has seen its promulgation crowned with wonderful success in India, in what Dr. Schlier calls "the Satansburgh of heathendom," and which Bishop Edward Thomson describes as "This great moral pest-house, this Babel of devils;" which has taught thousands of "heathen Chinee" to sing, with raptured lips, "All hail the power of Jesus' name!" which has its witnesses in all lands and in all tongues—will yet win its triumphs in all the dark domain of the False Prophet. The Cross shall be lifted higher than the Crescent; the sword shall be discarded as a weapon for the extension of the faith; the harem and the vision of a sensual heaven shall disappear; the *muezzin* who calls to prayer shall ask that it be offered in the name of Jesus; and Mohammedan mosques, like idolatrous temples, shall be converted into sanctuaries for the religion of the Christ.

The great cathedral of Damascus still stands, but the Christian church has been turned into a mosque. Over one magnificent portal the original inscription, written in Greek, still remains, unobliterated by time or hostile hands, and unheeded by the haughty ignorance of the Moslem. The saddened Christian is cheered as he reads the exhilarating and prophetic words, Ἡ *βασιλεία σου, Χριστέ, βασιλεία πάντων τῶν αἰώνων*—"Thy kingdom, O Christ, is an everlasting kingdom." It is the word of our God; and in beautiful Damascus—in profaned Jerusalem—in spoiled Alexandria—in Mecca, throne of the False Prophet—in Constantinople, so long trodden under foot by savage Turks—in Calcutta and Lahore—in Cabul and Candahar—in Asia, in Africa, and in all lands, the shout shall ring from earth to heaven, "Thy kingdom, O Christ, is an everlasting kingdom!"

The one unfailing key to history is in the avowed aim and object of our Lord and King to "set judgment in the earth."

This Messianic design, by peace or war, by the rise or fall of nations, will always be divinely promoted. The Prince of Judah will never turn from his great purpose to destroy idolatrous and despotic powers, to sweep away cruel superstitions and destructive infidelities, to lift up the under-foot humanity, to honor woman and to dignify childhood, to arch the sky of paganism with the rainbow of an immortal hope, to establish homes and schools and peaceful communities, to fill all lands with the splendors and glories of a Christian civilization, and to bring in and permanently establish the new earth and heaven. Neither Cossack nor Mussulman can stand athwart the prophetic purpose. Paganism will perish; empires, dynasties, and dominions of continental extent and colossal power will sink into decrepitude and death; but that which is for man, for his elevation and happiness, will survive every change, and will be crowned with ultimate success. This is the voice of all history; this is the gladdening truth now shining in the heavens; this is the Gospel assurance for the future of the race; and this will be the grand consummation of Messiah's glorious reign!

ART. VI.—AUTHORSHIP OF ECCLESIASTES.

No book in the sacred Canon has been more variously interpreted than Ecclesiastes. One reason for this is the fact that commentators are so little agreed in regard to its authorship. There are two schools, namely: 1. The Solomonic, which claims that it is from the pen of Solomon; and 2. (that which for convenience' sake we may designate) The non-Solomonic; a term vague in itself, but which comprises all those who, though widely differing in their interpretation of the book, yet agree in rejecting the Solomonic authorship. Tradition from the earliest times ascribes Ecclesiastes to Solomon. For many centuries very few doubted the correctness of this view; nearly the whole Church acquiesced in it; and thus by common consent it was generally believed to have been written by the wise king. During the Middle Ages it would have been considered heretical to regard it as a book written after the

Solomonic period. But with the Reformation came a new era in Biblical criticism. Theology in all its branches began to be treated much as any other science, and questions which had been regarded as forever settled were again openly discussed, and not seldom did the critics arrive at conclusions widely at variance with the dogmas previously accepted. Some of these new ideas appeared like mist, only to be swept away before the brilliant rays of the rising sun; others proved more real and abiding; a few still remain open questions.

In order to form a correct idea of the subject, it will be necessary to make use of all the light which we may have from ancient as well as modern hermeneutics, and therefore it will be profitable for us to begin by inquiring into the opinions held by the ancient Jewish expositors.

These, almost without dissent, favor the Solomonic origin. The Targum of Koheleth, written, perhaps, in the sixth century A. D., adopts the Solomonic authorship. So also the Midrash, and indeed the great mass of all Jewish commentators down to the last century.* While a very few of the ancient rabbis object to the canonicity of Ecclesiastes, none object to its authorship. The statement in the Talmud (Baba Bathra, fol. 14, 15) that the college of Hezekiah wrote (כָּתְבוּ) the book, or that of Rabbi Gedaliah (Shalshel Hakkal, fol. 66) that it was written by Isaiah,† does not necessarily mean that Ecclesiastes was composed by the college of Hezekiah or by Isaiah, for the word כָּתַב, as a rule, signifies to copy. Nevertheless, we must not forget that objections to its inspiration and canonicity were not wanting from the earliest times. Its canonicity was discussed in the Synod of Jerusalem, about 65 A. D., and afterward, A. D. 90, at the Synod of Yabne. The discussion was carried on between the schools of Hillel and Shammai, the latter deciding against, and the former for, its canonicity. The school of Shammai opposed its canonicity on doctrinal grounds, claiming that Ecclesiastes contained passages which are mutually contradictory, therefore irreconcilable, and consequently uninspired. The parts of the book to which objections are urged are, chap. ii, 2; vii, 3; viii, 15. (Sabbath, 30^{b}; Megilla, 7a.) Not only did certain portions of the book contradict

* Plumptre: "Commentary" on Ecclesiastes, p. 75.

† "Encyclopædia Britannica," art. "Ecclesiastes."

the others, but it was also at variance with Moses, therefore heretical. (Midrash Koheleth, under xi, 9.) The following are the two passages referred to: "Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes," etc., (Eccles. xi, 9,) which, according to the rabbis, could not be reconciled with Num. xv, 39: "And it shall be unto you for a fringe, that ye may look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the Lord, and that ye seek not after your own heart and your own eyes." These objections may seem puerile to us, and the passages may not contain even an apparent contradiction. They are cited by us simply as historical facts, and must be taken for what they are worth.

Jerome writes, that the Jews of his time were not without their objections to this book. According to him, they say: "Among other writings of Solomon which have become antiquated, and the memory of them lost, this book deserves to be obliterated, because it asserts that all the creatures of God are vain, and regards them as nothing, and it gives the preference to eating and drinking and other transitory pleasures." *

Finally, it may be stated that the learned modern Jewish rabbis discard the Solomonic origin of Ecclesiastes. No learned rabbi of our time upholds it.

In passing from the Jews to the early Christians, we might call attention to the fact that Ecclesiastes is nowhere quoted in the New Testament. This might be explained as favoring the view that the canonicity of the book was an open question in the first century of our era; however, but little weight can be attached to this argument, for on the same grounds several other books would have to be rejected. The apostolic Fathers and their immediate successors are equally sparing in their references to Ecclesiastes. Not till the end of the third century does the book seem to attract much attention. From this time on, the leading Fathers often mention the book, and some have left commentaries upon it. And, we may add, that with rare exceptions they are united in ascribing it to Solomon. Thus Gregory Thaumaturgus, (d. A. D. 270,) in his paraphrase of Koheleth; and Gregory of Nyssa, (d. A. D. 396,) in his expositions; Jerome (d. A. D. 420) and Augustine (d. A. D. 430.)

* Quoted by Stuart, "Commentary" on Ecclesiastes, sec. 6, p. 102.

The same might be said of Olympiodorus, in the early part of the sixth century. Yet there were individuals in the primitive centuries who did not regard the book as divine, and of course as not coming from the pen of Solomon. Thus Philastrius of Brescia (d. A. D. 387) speaks of heretics who rejected Solomon's Ecclesiastes, (Haer., 130,)* and according to Stuart,† both Philastrius and Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. A. D. 429) considered the book as uninspired because it savors of Epicureanism. The question must have been openly discussed in the sixth century, for A. D. 553 the Synod of Constantinople declared the book free from the charge of teaching Epicureanism. But beyond these few objectors, the great mass of authority, both Jewish and Christian, declares most decidedly and unequivocally for the Solomonic origin of Ecclesiastes; and were we compelled to form a verdict from the testimony of early writers, nothing could be done but, as impartial judges, to declare that Solomon was the author of Ecclesiastes.

Uniform, however, as this *consensus* is, amounting almost to the "*Semper, ubique, et ab omnibus,*" which Vincent of Lerins made the test of Catholicity, it can scarcely be regarded as decisive. The faculty of historical criticism, and one might almost say, of intellectual discernment of the meaning and drift of a book or of individual passages in it, is, with rare exceptions, such as were Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Theodore of Mopsuestia, wanting in the long succession of the Christian Fathers, and no one can read the Targum or Midrash on Koheleth, or the comments of most of their successors, without feeling that he is in the company of those who have eyes and see not, and who seem to read between the lines, as patristic interpreters also do, meanings which could by no conceivable possibility have been present to the thoughts of the writer. It is true alike of all of them that they lived at too remote a date from that of the book of which they write for their opinions to have any weight as original evidence, and that they had no materials for forming such opinions other than those which are in our hand at the present day.‡

The Middle Ages, as might be expected, afford no new light on this question. The few writers who wrote on Koheleth merely walk in the footsteps of their predecessors. The three

* Hengstenberg, "Commentary," Introduction, p. 34.

† Stuart, Introduction, p. 103.

‡ Plumptre, "Cambridge Bible for Schools," Ecclesiastes, Introduction, p. 22.

leading commentators, Hugo of St. Victor in the twelfth century, Bonaventura in the thirteenth, and Nicolas de Lyra in the fourteenth, are firm in their declaration for Solomon.

With the great Reformation a new era came. Till then books were not studied in a critical spirit, philology and the philosophy of history were unknown sciences; so that the Dark Ages afforded no revelation in regard to our book is no cause of surprise. Ideas must not be rejected simply on account of their newness; much less, as is often the case by a certain class of reformers, on account of their great age. Neither are we under obligation to regard all questions as ultimately settled by our ancestors. If new light come, we should accept it and be thankful; if not, remain by the old. New discoveries are continually made, and no one deserves the name of teacher who is not willing to be surpassed by some brilliant disciple. It is needless to state that great revolutions have taken place since the Monk of Erfurt commenced to read and study the Holy Writ. It was reserved for Luther, who brought so much light into the religious and theological world, to call the attention of still more critical minds to some of the peculiarities of Ecclesiastes, and that, strange as it may seem, not in his commentary on Koheleth, where he accepts the Solomonic authorship, but in his "Table Talk," (Tisch-reden.) * He says: "Thus he" (Solomon) "did not himself write the Preacher, but it was composed by Sirach, at the time of the Maccabees. It is, however, a very good and agreeable book, because it contains much fine instruction in regard to the household. In addition, it is like a Talmud put together from many books, perhaps from the library of Ptolemy Euergetes, king of Egypt." Luther was not a commentator, but a reformer. We must, therefore, not be surprised that he does not more fully develop this new view.

So, in a sense, it is rightly claimed by most commentators that Hugo Grotius (1644) was the first to reject the Solomonic authorship, with any degree of reason and learning, upon purely scientific grounds. He was, as we see from the following, driven to it for philological reasons. "Yet," says he, "I do not consider it to be a work of Solomon, but to have been written later under the name of that king, who had been moved by penitence. My ground for this opinion is, that there are

* Lange's "Bibelwerk," ed. 1867, "Der Prediger Salomo," Einleitung, p. 110.

many words in it which are not found elsewhere other than in Daniel, Ezra, and the Chaldean commentators." From his time there has been a gradual departure from the traditional view. And indeed it was not long till some of the more distinguished biblical critics adopted and developed the views of Grotius. The book was studied as never before; the language was put to the severest critical tests. Some, in their eagerness to overthrow the Solomonic authorship, were too hasty, and cited a great number of words and phrases which, according to them, were not in use till after the captivity; but on closer examination many of these supposed post-exilian words were found in the pre-exilian books. Others, again, completely disregarding every philological argument, held most tenaciously to the tradition of the fathers. But ever since the days of Grotius the number of this latter class has decreased in proportion to their critical acumen and appreciation of the laws relating to the history of language; so that, in our day, the preponderance of authority rejects the Solomonic authorship. Says a recent English writer: * "On the Continent, where biblical criticism has been cultivated to the highest degree, and where Old Testament exegesis has become an exact science, the attempt to prove that Solomon is not the author of Ecclesiastes would be viewed in the same light as adducing facts to demonstrate that the earth does not stand still." This would not apply with equal force to England or the United States, though some of the more distinguished scholars in both these countries are not less decided in their rejection of the Solomonic origin of Ecclesiastes. The same may be said of the Protestant theologians of France, whose views are perhaps expressed by Louis Segond in Lichtenberger.†

Ewald,‡ in his day the prince of Hebrew scholars, than whom no one could have been found of greater authority in Semitic philology and literature in all its branches, is pronounced against the traditional view, and claims that the book is among the latest ones of the Old Testament. He bases his opinion on the peculiarities of language, ideas, and the relation of Ecclesiastes to the older books. He goes so far as to claim that it differs

* "Encylopædia Britannica," art. "Ecclesiastes."

† "Encyclo. des Sciences Religieuses," art. "Eccles."

‡ "Poetische Bücher," ed. 1837, vol. iv, p. 178.

more widely from the old Hebrew than any book in the Old Testament, and that it is a work of an author of whom we have nothing else in the Canon.

As far as we know, the first theologian in this country to accept the new criticism in regard to our book was the devout and erudite scholar, Prof. Moses Stuart, the father of biblical criticism in the United States. He discusses the question at great length in the learned introduction to his "Commentary on Ecclesiastes." * His influence as an exegete has been very great, and it naturally follows that he has many admirers and followers. Whatever else may be said, one thing is absolutely certain, that no American was more capable of expressing an opinion upon the subject under discussion than the late Prof. Stuart.

It may be very appropriate in this place to ascertain, if possible, what stand Methodist commentators have taken upon the question. We as a Church are indebted to no one man more than to Dr. Adam Clarke, who in his day was not only the foremost of Wesleyan expositors, but also held a high rank among the learned biblical scholars of England. Hence it is befitting that we should first hear him. In his introduction to the Book of Ecclesiastes he writes as follows:

> Of the authenticity of the Book of Ecclesiastes I have no doubt, but I must say, the language and style puzzle me not a little. *Chaldaisms and Syriaisms* are certainly frequent in it, and not a few *Chaldee words* and terminations; and the style is such as may be seen in those writers who lived at or after the Captivity. If these can be reconciled with the age of Solomon I have no objection; but the attempts that have been made to deny this, and overthrow the evidence, are in my view often trifling and generally ineffectual. That Solomon, son of David, might have been *author* of the *whole matter* of this, and a *subsequent writer* put it in his own language, is a possible case; and were this to be allowed, it would solve all difficulties. †

Dr. Harman is more decided and outspoken. These are his words: "We think there can be but little doubt that it is the latest book of the Canon, and could not have been written earlier than the time of Malachi; but in all probability it was written still later." ‡

* Stuart's "Commentary" on Ecclesiastes, ed. 1864. Andover.

† Clarke's "Commentary," Introduction to Ecclesiastes.

‡ Harman's "Introduction," third edition, p. 318.

The next American commentator of our own Church who has written on this subject is the Rev. A. B. Hyde, D.D. I refer to his "Ecclesiastes" in Whedon's "Commentary." From the introduction it would be difficult to find out his exact position in regard to the authorship of the book. He says: "This question of authorship must not be made too important."* But as we shall have occasion to call up Dr. Hyde in another place we may for the present dismiss him.

It would be very unfair not to mention here an article written by my dear friend and old professor, Dr. Strong,† where the question of authorship is ably discussed; the author evidently leans to the Solomonic origin. Notwithstanding the above citations from Drs. Clarke, Harman, and Hyde, which in some sense of the word may be classed as our "standards" on Koheleth, yet the great majority of Methodist ministers, the world over, have accepted the old rabbinical tradition (Midrash Yalkut, Eccl. i, 1) that Koheleth was written by Solomon toward the latter part of his days, Proverbs in middle age, and Canticles in his youth. This, though nothing more than a tradition, is generally accepted by the ordinary readers of Ecclesiastes, just as many good but not liberally educated Christians ascribe all the Psalms to David and all the Book of Proverbs to Solomon. Needless is it to say that no careful student, even of our English version of the Bible, could entertain such views of the origin of the Psalms and Proverbs. Yet so carelessly do many of us study the sacred books, and such is the power tradition exercises over us, that we are often loth to part with our dearly cherished, child-like ideas. In passing we might mention the deplorable fact that the Bible is not more thoroughly studied—its history, its canonicity, its present form, etc., etc.

But to enter more fully into our discussion, it might be said that the objections of critics to the Solomonic origin of Ecclesiastes may be divided into two principal classes:

I. The Linguistic Peculiarities.

II. The Subject-matter.

I. Let us, in the first place, try to put before the reader the argument drawn from the philological stand-point. We

* Whedon's "Commentary," vol. vi, p. 484.

† M'Clintock and Strong, "Cyclopædia," art. "Ecclesiastes."

readily admit the recent origin of the argument drawn from this quarter; nevertheless, the newness of an argument is no valid objection against it. It could not be otherwise; for, be it remembered, that philology is comparatively a modern science. The evidence drawn from this source will appear of little or of great weight according to the linguistic training of the reader. To some who are altogether unacquainted with the Hebrew lexicon and grammar, and who depend entirely upon the English Bible, it will be, I am afraid, as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal, not because there is no reality in the argument, but because they have no suitable training to appreciate it.

Every language, no less than every nation, has its history, well-defined and more or less complete. New words and new forms are continually arising. How easy it is to trace many words back to their origin! The new edition of Webster's Dictionary has thousands of new words, and obsolete words are also very numerous. "One cometh and another passeth away," is the law written on all things. We need only call attention to our own language. Even the most careless cannot fail to see the difference between Wyclif and Wesley, between Chaucer and Shakespeare, or between Spenser and Tennyson. To a Hebrew scholar the variety of style and peculiarity of language is also very apparent in the different books of the Bible. This consideration justifies the conclusion that the Hebrew language has its history, capable, like all other studied languages, of being divided into periods. The most superficial student of Hebrew must admit that this language has at least two well-defined periods: the pre-exilian and the post-exilian. I am satisfied that the philological argument will have the least weight with those who have never studied our book in a critical manner. But whatever importance may be given to these verbal differences, they are certainly real, and must not be lightly passed over.

The style of Koheleth differs not only from the other acknowledged writings of Solomon, but from any thing else in the Old Testament, and for this the unique character of the subjects treated in the book will not sufficiently account. That portion of Proverbs written by Solomon is in fine, elegant, concise language, while Ecclesiastes for the most part is

full of repetition and irregularities. What is true of the style is in a greater degree true of the words and expressions used. Says the learned Hengstenberg: "Hand in hand with the evidence against Solomon, drawn from the historical circumstances of the work, goes that which is derived from peculiarities of style and language. These are undeniably not those of the time of Solomon, but of the later post-exile period." * Delitzsch, professor of Old Testament theology in the University of Leipsic, an Israelite by birth, a most ardent lover of Hebrew literature, both biblical and rabbinical, a most devout Christian, like Hengstenberg, quite orthodox, discussing this subject, says: "If the Book of Koheleth be of Solomonic origin, then there is no history to the Hebrew language."† It would be very easy to add the testimony of the leading biblical critics, but this will suffice to call the attention of the reader to the validity of the philological objections urged against the Solomonic origin.

It is common for writers on Ecclesiastes to give a list, more or less complete, of words and expressions in the book which they consider as being later than the Solomonic age. These words may be divided into three classes:

1. Those which are only found in the later books, as in Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, or Daniel.

2. Those which are not found in any other of the books of the Bible, but simply in rabbinical literature.

3. Those found only in Ecclesiastes.

The fullest list, as far as I have seen, is that given by Professor Delitzsch in his commentary.‡

All commentators in our day, of whatever school of thought, willingly acknowledge that the language of Ecclesiastes is not only peculiar, but that it more closely resembles that of the writers after than before the exile. The attempts to explain these away have been various—certainly more various than successful. One of the most commonly adopted explanations is that already referred to above; namely, that the book was written toward the close of Solomon's life. This to them sufficiently accounts for the difference of style between Eccle-

* "Commentary on Ecclesiastes," Introduction, p. 9. † *Ibid.*, p. 190.

‡ Introduction, pp. 190–196. See also the Introduction to Stuart and Lange's Commentaries, and the article on Ecclesiastes in M'Clintock and Strong's "Cyclopædia."

siastes and his other writings. But what is there, besides the old Jewish tradition, in support of the theory that Ecclesiastes is the latest production of Solomon's pen? Would it be any easier to establish this than to prove that the book in its present form is of post-exilian origin? We think not. Rev. W. T. Bullock, M.A., readily adopts the above view, and finds sufficient confirmation from other authors, both ancient and modern. Says he:* "In our own language the style of Milton in his 'Ode on the Nativity,' written in his twenty-first year, differs widely from 'Samson Agonistes,' a product of his old age. In our own generation, there is a remarkable difference between the earlier prose style of Dean Milman and that of his 'History of Latin Christianity.'"

Others, again, like Dr. Cowles,† dispose of Aramaisms and other linguistic peculiarities on the ground that Solomon had learned them from his intimacy with foreigners, "his wives and concubines, his political friends and his commercial acquaintances." They also adduce, as further explanation of these foreign terms, the supposition that the book was written especially for these foreigners; consequently, there could have been nothing more natural for Solomon than to use words and phrases which, though not pure Hebrew, yet were such as were perfectly familiar to those for whom the book was intended. This theory—for certainly it is nothing more—will not satisfy a critical mind. There is no evidence that the book was written for foreigners, for the outlandish women who flocked to the royal court at Jerusalem, or for the political allies of King Solomon. The sacred books of the Hebrews were not written for the heathen, but for the seed of Abraham. Dr. Tayler Lewis, though a stanch supporter of the Solomonic origin of Ecclesiastes, as may be seen in his appendix to the Introduction to Koheleth by Zöckler in Lange's "Commentary," is defending an almost hopeless cause. Read the following: "There may be allowed the idea of a later editor, or recensor, who may have added some of the short prose scholia by way of explanation, even as they were added to the Pentateuch—some few parenthetical insertions of the name Koheleth where it was deemed necessary more clearly to announce the speaker, and

* "Bible Commentary," Introduction to Ecclesiastes.

† "Commentary" on Ecclesiastes, p. 220, ff.

perhaps some modernizations of the language, or the adaptation of it to a later period." * But where is the proof that the Jews thus tampered with their sacred books? The average reader will prefer to accept a later authorship, than a revised version of the original Solomonic work by a later hand.

Others claim that these verbal diffe ences "ought to have but little weight in argument;" so little, indeed, "that small mention need be made of them." Dr. Hyde † limits these words to about ten, although Delitzsch, who wrote as late as 1875, finds more than ten times ten words or forms in some way peculiar to the book under consideration. But what if the number could be reduced to ten? If it can be proved that we have here ten words of later origin than Solomon's time, would not that suffice to disprove the Solomonic origin? Would a student of English in a thousand years from now hesitate to declare that a book containing any two of the following words, "gerrymander, bulldoze, telephone, class-meeting, cablegram, telegram, loot, or dude, could not have been written as early as the sixteenth century?" A skillful anatomist can tell by the careful examination of a single bone the kind, and as well the approximate size, of the animal. So also in philology. The age of a book is determined by the words and expressions used. Even one word has sometimes sufficed to explode great literary forgeries. Let one instance be given: "Some years ago a set of poems was published at Bristol purporting to have been written in very early times by a poet named Rowley. Literary controversy ran high about them; many persons believed in their genuineness; some do, even now. But the imposture, which was not easy to detect at the time, has been completely unmasked by the aid of a little word of three letters. The writer uses 'its' as the possessive case of the pronoun 'it' of the neuter gender. Now, this possessive 'its' was never so used in the early periods of our language; nor, indeed, as late down as the time of Elizabeth. It never occurs in the English version of the Bible, made in its present authorized form in the reign of James I. It is said, also, to occur only three times in Shakespeare, and once in 'Paradise Lost.' ‡

* Lange's "Commentary," Appendix to Introduction, p. 29.

† Whedon's "Commentary" on Ecclesiastes, p. 482.

‡ Alford's "Queen's English," p. 7.

Besides these words, there is another point especially worthy of mention, though not urged as conclusive; that is, the very frequent use of the shortened form of the relative pronoun, (שֶׁ instead of אֲשֶׁר.) This shorter form, it is true, is occasionally used in the earlier books of the Bible, and also in the Phenician remains; but in the later books, as well as in the later Psalms, this form is very common. In Ecclesiastes it is found no less than sixty-eight times. The Talmud and other rabbinical writings, as well as modern Hebrew, use the shorter form almost exclusively. Again, in no other book of the Bible are the meanings given to this word in its various combinations so various as in Ecclesiastes.

There is also a difference in the use of the tenses, which students in their second year cannot fail to observe. The "*vav conversive*" is seldom used, and there is a noticeable preference given to the participial form of the verb.

Again, the author of Ecclesiastes, in speaking of the Divine Being, never uses the word "*Jehovah*," but always (thirty-nine times) Elohim. This is certainly a remarkable fact, and is regarded as of some weight in determining the authorship of the book. It is said that in the post-biblical period, the Jews, being restrained by a religious dread, scarcely ever used the word Jehovah. The use of Elohim does not necessarily point out a later age, but it certainly points out a difference of style, for in the Proverbs Solomon uses almost exclusively the word Jehovah; but why Solomon should use Jehovah so often in Proverbs, and abstain most carefully from its use in Koheleth, is not clear.

II. Objections based on other than linguistic grounds, that is, on the subject-matter, or the contents of the book.

Although objections to the Solomonic origin of Ecclesiastes were first based on purely philological grounds, yet in the course of time others of an entirely different nature were added to them. It could not be otherwise. The study of literature and history has been reduced and developed into an exact science. The literature of a people bears the impress of the age in which it was written. Not only do we find philological differences, but also difference in style, matter, and treatment. The influence may be political, religious, or philosophical. Says a modern writer: "The political influences

which act in the development and modification of literature are many and potent; and these, unlike the influence of race, differ more or less in every age. Their effect may, as a rule, be traced with the greatest facility; and the writers on whom they have produced no marked impressions are few indeed. Perhaps the most powerful influence of all is that exerted by the form of government, which results in material prosperity or social degradation. Unjust rule in France has produced greater popular misery than in any other country in Europe. As a consequence we find their literature studded over with the traces of this external suffering, and with the marks of a spirit of fiery impatience and revolt." *

In a critical examination of Ecclesiastes it becomes evident that many things discussed in the book do not well suit the Solomonic era, and that many others could have scarcely come from the pen of the royal writer himself. A king would be the last to write such a book as we have before us.

The first objection under this head to which I wish to call attention is, the constant reference to tyranny and oppressive government. It runs like a stream from one end of the book to the other. Governors and rulers of all grades ruthlessly trample under foot the dearest and most sacred rights. So great were these oppressions that, according to our author, death itself would be a release. It would not be an easy task to prove that such passages as are found here could have been written during one of the most peaceful and prosperous reigns of any of the Jewish kings. Whatever faults King Solomon may have had, the sacred chroniclers do not bring his tyranny, or that of his officers, into any such prominence as would warrant the bitter wailing of the author of Ecclesiastes. Take the following examples: "I saw under the sun the place of judgment, *that* wickedness *was* there; and the place of righteousness, *that* iniquity *was* there:" (iii, 16.) "So I returned, and considered all the oppressions that are done under the sun: and behold the tears of *such as were* oppressed, and they had no comforter; and on the side of their oppressors *there was* power; but they had no comforter:" (iv, 1.) The repetition of the last clause makes it very emphatic in Hebrew. So glaring was the injustice, and so violent the oppression, practiced in

* Van Laun, "History of French Literature," vol. i, p. 10.

the land during the time of the author, that he concludes that death is preferable to life. "Wherefore," continues he, "I praised the dead which are already dead, more than the living which are yet alive. Yea, better is he than both they, which hath not yet been, who hath not seen the evil work that is done under the sun," (iv, 2, 3.) It would be easy to multiply passages which seem very difficult to reconcile with the history of the reign of Solomon. They seem to be anachronistic, utterly inexplicable. "Folly is set in great dignity, and the rich sit in low places." "I have seen servants upon horses, and princes walking as servants upon the earth:" (x, 6, 7.) "Woe to thee, O land, when thy king is a child, and thy princes eat in the morning:" (x, 16.) On the other hand, when we compare the sentiments expressed in these verses to later times, when the poor Jews were oppressed by foreign officials, and when extortion and plunder was the order of the day, how like real history is our book! (Compare Esther iii, 1; Neh. ix, 36, 37.) The remarkable passage near the close of the book (x, 20) seems also to point most clearly to other times than those of Solomon. The author says: "Curse not the king, no, not in thy thought; and curse not the rich in thy bedchamber: for a bird of the air shall carry the voice, and that which hath wings shall tell the matter." The reference here is, beyond doubt, to the well-established system of espionage, which in ancient times stretched itself like a network over the empires of despotic kings. Espionage is always the index of a mean, corrupt, tyrannical, and pusillanimous despot, but never of a noble man. What is there in the history of Solomon corresponding of the sentiment expressed in this verse? Our latest Methodist commentator, Dr. Hyde, finds but little difficulty in reconciling the linguistic peculiarities of Ecclesiastes with the idea that it was written by Solomon; yet he fairly stumbles when he comes to the exposition of this passage. Listen to him: "As the general subject of discreet behavior in the trying times produced by bad rulers occupies so large a proportion of this brief book, we may, on dismissing it, again say that its moral weight as against the Solomonic authorship is very serious. The books of the Scripture, though written for all time, get their special form and matter from and for some particular time. So much of exhortation to patient

endurance under misgovernment could not possibly have been inspired by any thing known to have existed in the golden age of Solomon. But there was hardly a year in the interval between 450 B. C. and 330 B. C. when such wisdom of the serpent and harmlessness of the dove was not wanted in almost every province of the Persian empire." *

Let us next call attention to the skeptical questions discussed in the book. This ought to afford some help in determining the age in which it was written. In whatever light we regard these, or try to explain them, they are here. We may regard portions of this book as a dialogue between the author and some skeptical objector, or they may be the struggling of a soul for light, a mere mental dialogue, a style common to all languages.

If, then, it is true that we have in this book traces of skepticism, as already said, this ought to aid us in determining its age. Every age has its special topics. Authors write upon subjects claiming common attention, upon themes which are part and parcel of the every-day life of a people. It would not be natural in our day and country to devote great attention to evils and dangers which in no way threaten us. A treatise on the evils of American slavery, for instance, written in 1884, would be anachronistic and unnecessary; but fifty years ago nothing would have been more proper and timely. Slavery has been abolished, and now other topics claim our attention. The age of Solomon was eminently religious; divine manifestations were not infrequent; it was then that the temple was built, and that the religion of Jehovah pervaded the land. Solomon might have been guilty of idolatry, but where is the proof that he or any other leader of thought in his time was troubled with questions which in later ages developed into Sadduceeism? In reading the history of doctrine in the Christian Church we see that certain questions had special prominence in certain centuries: Gnosticism, in one age; Arianism, in another; and Pelagianism, in a third. So also in the Old Testament, in the ancient Jewish Church, there must have been something similar. The age of Solomon, as far as we have any means of judging, was not a skeptical one; therefore we are not prepared to admit that a book containing so many

* Whedon's "Commentary" on Ecclesiastes, chap. x, 20.

questions respecting doubts of future life and God's moral government in this world could belong to his time. The question, "Who knoweth whether * the spirit of the sons of men goeth upward, and whether the spirit of a beast goeth downward to the earth?" (iii, 21,) although satisfactorily and in a most orthodox manner answered in xii, 7, suits the post-exilian time much better than that of Solomon—a time when the ancient landmarks were giving way, when even the seed of Abraham were becoming rationalistic and skeptical.

Attention might be called to the fact that Malachi, which is considered the last book of the Canon, has in this and also other respects some similarity to Koheleth. The laxity described in regard to paying vows (v, 4, 5) which had been made, finds an exact counterpart in the description of the Church given by the prophet Malachi, but not in the time of Solomon, when the people manifested such love and generosity for the worship of Jehovah. The word מַלְאָךְ, *angel*, which evidently refers to the officiating priest who was to receive the offering which was vowed, is also found in Malachi ii, 7. Another point which ought not to be passed unnoticed is the fact, that this book, which is so generally ascribed to Solomon, does not even contain his name. The proper name of the author, whoever he may have been, is not given. In this particular it resembles the Epistle to the Hebrews. The author for some reason takes the assumed name *Koheleth*, which is variously translated, but which is well expressed by our English word *Preacher*. At first sight this may seem of little or of no importance; nevertheless, there must have been some reason for this fictitious name. We readily admit that there is passage after passage wherein the author describes himself, exactly such as Solomon would have written. Some passages seem to point to him directly and cannot bear any other interpretation; for example, He was son of David, king over Israel in Jerusalem: (i, 1, 12.) He made himself great works, builded himself houses, gathered himself silver and gold. He was great and increased more than all that were before him in Jerusalem, etc., etc.: (ii, 4–10.) We do not shut our eyes to

* I take the ה before עֹלָה and יֹרֶדֶת to be the He interrogative, and not the article. So the LXX, Vulgate, Targum, Syriac, Arabic, Jerome, Luther, Stuart, Delitzsch, etc.

these passages, so strongly favoring the Solomonic origin of Ecclesiastes. Yet further on we propose a word of explanation. But, notwithstanding these, we might ask the question, If Solomon wrote this book, why did he write under the assumed title of Koheleth? Why in this book more than in Proverbs or Canticles?* In vain would it be to reply, as some have done, that he represents himself in our book not as a king but as a preacher, for that would apply equally well to the Proverbs. But before we dismiss this subject, let us call attention to the form of the word קֹהֶלֶת, (Koheleth.) Though feminine in form, it doubtless refers to a male. Men are often designated by the name (which may be feminine) of the office which they hold. We have examples of this usage not only in the Semitic or Oriental languages, but also in some of the Indo-European, as in German and French.† We often find it in Chaldee and Arabic, and it was not unusual in later Hebrew to designate men by the office which they held, or by their trade. Take the feminine word פַּחָה, (pascha,) a word, according to Fürst,‡ which was transplanted into Hebrew by early Assyrian influence, and which stands in the later written books. Compare also the forms Sophereth (Ezra ii, 55, Neh. vii, 57) and Pochereth, (Ezra ii, 57, Neh. vii, 59,) which show that such formations were in use in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. This usage of coining feminine nouns for the name of men is carried still further in the Mischna.§ Thus we see that the very title of the book speaks loudly in favor of a post-exilian origin.

In discussing the authorship of Ecclesiastes, commentators always call attention to the verb הָיִיתִי: (i, 12.) It is the preterit form.‖ "I, Koheleth, *was* king over Israel in Jerusalem." The preterit tense in this verse, and the *vav* conversive with the future in the following, point to time already past. At least that is the common way in which these forms are used. If the writer had wished to refer to the present, he could have either used the participial form or else omitted the verb altogether. Thus, then, we are at once necessitated to

* See Prov. i, 1; Solomon's Song i, 1.

† Stuart's "Commentary" on Ecclesiastes, chap. i, 1.

‡ "Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon," פחה.

§ See various examples in Delitzsch's "Commentary" on Ecclesiastes, p. 204.

‖ For an able discussion, see Delitzsch's "Commentary," pp. 205, ff.

suppose that at the writing of this book Solomon had ceased to be king, had abdicated. And that is the way the ancient Jewish commentators understood and explained the passage. In the Targum or paraphrase of Koheleth we have the following comment on the verse, (i, 12:) "When king Solomon was sitting upon the throne of his kingdom, his heart became very proud of his riches, and he transgressed the word of God, and he gathered many horses and chariots, and riders, and he amassed much gold and silver, and he married from foreign nations; whereupon the anger of the Lord was kindled against him, and he sent to him Ashmodai, the king of the demons, who drove him from the throne of his kingdom, and took away the ring from his hand in order that he should wander about the world to reprove it, and he went about in the provincial towns and cities of the land of Israel, weeping and lamenting, and saying, *I am Koheleth, whose* name *was* formerly *called Solomon*, who *was* king over Israel in Jerusalem." This legend, childish as it is, proves one thing most conclusively, namely, that the preterit form of the verb was a real stumbling block to the ancient expositors, who invented it. The most eminent Hebrew scholars, such as Stuart, Ewald, and Delitzsch, agree that it must refer to a past time. Mr. Bullock, in his comment on this verse, finds a parallel case in Louis XIV.,* who, toward the end of his days, gave up all earthly interests in order to think only of God, and who at that time was often heard to exclaim, "When I was king!" This needs no refutation, for there is a great difference between a whole book well written and the mere exclamation of an old ruler ready to die.

Those who accept the traditional view often claim that Ecclesiastes is a book containing the confession of King Solomon. To them it is a satisfactory evidence that the wise king, toward the close of life, "repented of his unholy practices and licentious principles."† It is needless to inform the reader that there is not a single word in the Holy Writ to corroborate this view, so commonly held. We have not a single sentence pointing to the repentance of Solomon.. Said a learned man

* "Nouvelle Biographie Generale," xxxi, 834, quoted by Bullock, "Commentary" on Ecclesiastes, p. 623.

† Angus, "Bible Hand-book," p. 512.

to me a few days ago: "Brother, deny the Solomonic origin of Ecclesiastes, and Solomon is lost." But, were it well established that Solomon wrote this book, what is there to show that he wrote it in his old age, after he had sinned and lost the favor of God? Nothing more than an old rabbinical tradition. But had we proof conclusive—which we are far from admitting—that he is the author, there is absolutely nothing in the book to prove that he repented. None but a prejudiced mind can see confession in any portion of it. It is rather the work of an experimenter who becomes utterly disgusted with the world and its vanities, than the sincere confession of one who had sinned against God. If it were a confession, we might expect some explicit reference to some former sins by which the author had been led away from Jehovah, something similar to the fifty-first Psalm. But there is nothing of that in the book before us. Ecclesiastes is certainly more of a philosophical treatise than the humble confession of a penitent sinner. Had we a confession from the royal ruler, we might find some similarity between it and the beautiful prayer uttered by him at the dedication of the temple. If Koheleth be the confession of Solomon, the confession has been omitted, and some valuable exhortation has been substituted. Now, what were the chief sins of Solomon? They were, (1) alliance with the heathen; (2) loving many strange women; and (3) turning away his heart after other gods. 1 Kings xi, 1–8. These three sins were to the pious Jews of the most grievous kind, and they are constantly condemned by the prophets. In the Old Testament no sin is denounced so much and so often as that of idolatry. It seems to be the sad key-note of the earlier prophets. Then, if idolatry were the chief sin of Solomon, and were such an eye-sore to the pious Jew, why is there not some mention made of it in our book? Not only is there no command to abstain from it, nor any thing like the sad strains of a penitent confessing his participation therein—there is not even any reference to it in any way whatever. The same may be said in regard to the other two sins above mentioned. We, then, confess our inability to see any thing in Ecclesiastes resembling a confession. Let those, then, who have been accustomed to regard this book as proving the final repentance of Solomon remember that there are some valid objections against

their theory. Let them not be too loud in condemnation of our views; for what they themselves regard as settled truths may become on more careful examination at best but hypotheses. If Solomon did repent, there is no record of it in Ecclesiastes. The book could not have been written in his old age, else some reference to idolatry and the evils of polygamy would have been made. If he did not write it in the latter part of his life, then the most ancient tradition ascribing its authorship to Solomon becomes worthless, and certainly leaves grounds for other views.

One more objection of some weight is, the fact that no mention is made of this most important book in 1 Kings iv, 32, 33, where a list of Solomon's works is given.

Perhaps none of these arguments, taken singly and alone, will appear of much weight; but certainly, when brought together, and viewed in one connected chain, our position in regard to the authorship of Ecclesiastes is any thing but weak.

As already stated, there are certain passages in the book which clearly point to Solomon as the author; this explains why supporters of the Solomonic origin have been so many and so positive. But in conclusion let me ask, What objection can there be to believe that the author, whoever he may have been, adopted a personated authorship? That he makes Solomon the main character in the book, and through him utters his own words and ideas? The same as Socrates in the Krito of Plato, or Faust in the masterpiece of Goethe, or other characters in the fictitious and dramatic works of both ancient and modern writers. This is done in compositions of this sort without any idea of deception or imposture. "A dramatic personation of character has, at all times, been looked upon as a legitimate form of authorship, not necessarily involving any *animus decipiendi*. . . . If dramatic personation be, in all times and countries, a legitimate method of instruction, there is no *a priori* ground against the employment of that method by the manifold and very varied wisdom (Eph. iii, 10) of the Eternal Spirit." If this view of personated authorship is admissible and compatible with inspiration, then it is morally certain that Solomon did not write Ecclesiastes.

ART. VII.—WILLIAMS'S "MIDDLE KINGDOM."

OF this well-known work on China, issued by Putnam in 1848, revised by the author, and re-issued by the Scribners in 1883, the reading public will require something more than a passing notice editorial. The recent demise of the writer makes it appropriate to preface a review of his book with brief notices of his life and labors. This most distinguished lay missionary of the century, late professor of Chinese in Yale College, passed to his final rest on Saturday, February 16, at 8:40 P. M. in the City of Elms, full of years, honors, and usefulness. It is seldom that any man is privileged to bring his life-labors to a rounded close. Most men are surprised by the last summons with some unfinished piece of work in hand. Six years ago, February 6, 1878, Dr. Williams said, in a note to the writer: "I am using my imperfect eye-sight to revise 'The Middle Kingdom.' This job of work seems to be about as useful as any I can undertake." Here we have the key to his every undertaking. During fifty years of active life he had always some "job of work" on hand that looked toward the "useful." Inutility was incompatible with his earnest nature. A severe fall, a dislocated shoulder, and paralysis came as premonitory warnings. April 16, 1883, he writes again: "In March last year I had a partial paralysis of brain, from which I am slowly recovering. My son has revised the copy of 'The Middle Kingdom,' which, fortunately, was almost ready for the press. I have no expectation of doing any thing more after the book is out." It was his last work. The last touch was given to the preface in July. It was on the book-sellers' shelves in October, and at the time of the brief notice of it in the January "Quarterly" the venerable writer was in his final decline.

Two of the numerous pen-works of this diligent book-maker are specially monumental, and will long remain as proofs of native and acquired ability combined with rare opportunities. They are "The Middle Kingdom," and an "Anglo-Chinese Dictionary:" the one a wide survey of the Chinese Empire from the earliest times to the present, for the English reader; the other a much-needed help to the increasing number of students

of the Chinese language. How came he by the ability to prepare works so widely differing? Something may have been due to the fact that he belonged to one of the most prolific of the book-making tribes of the English race. Aside from the omnipresent and scarcely numerable Smiths, the Williamses are only second or third in the numbers sent by any one of the Anglo-Saxon *gens* into the fields of literature and authorship. For personal qualifications he was indebted to fortunate birth, solid education, and favorable surroundings. His father, William Williams, was a prominent citizen of Utica, engaged in the book and publishing business in one of the largest establishments west of Albany, a leading man in all benevolent enterprises, and an elder in the First Presbyterian Church. His eldest son, Samuel Wells, (S. Wells he always wrote it, after the family name of his mother, Sophia Wells,) was born in Utica, September 22, 1812. The pious and devoted mother silently dedicated her first-born to the cause of foreign missions. For the reason we have not far to seek. Carey, Ward, and Marshman, pioneers in India, had been heard of in the religious journals of America; Morrison had sailed for China from England by the way of New York, because the jealous East India Company refused him passage in their ships. The quintet of devoted Andover students,* graduates of Harvard, Williams, Brown, and Union respectively, had created a Board of Foreign Missions by their enthusiasm, and in February, 1812, with a quintet of brave wives, had stirred the soul of the American Church to its holiest depths by embarking, in the slow-sailing ships of the period, for an India that seemed as far off and shadowy as it had done to the mariners of Columbus three hundred and twenty years before.

Brought up in the purlieus of a printing-office, what more natural than that Wells should be a printer, familiar from boyhood with all the mysteries of type-setting and all the details of book publishing. All his works show the results of this initial training. Rudimentary studies were pursued in academy and high school. To his pious parents the cause of missions was particularly dear, and their children were reared to love and respect the work. In 1820, when Wells was eight years old, a young man, James Garrett, connected with his father's

* Newell, Hall, Rice, Judson, Nott.

printing-office, was sent to Ceylon as missionary printer, an event which made a deep and lasting impression on his child-mind. Converted and brought into the Church in 1831, his father was disposed to send him to college, but inclination for the natural sciences decided him to go to the Rensselaer Institute, Troy, under the care of the distinguished scientific specialist Amos Eaton, for whose botanical manual, published in 1833, young Williams wrote out the derivations. In April, 1832, he received an invitation to go to China as printer to the American Board Mission, deliberated on it for a single night, and accepted; spent a year at home in study and mechanical preparation, and in mid-June, 1833, sailed from New York in the ship "Morrison," reaching Whampoa, the anchorage-ground for the city of Canton, on the 25th of October following. In his passage up the Pearl River, ten or twelve miles, he took his first lessons in a language that was to become as familiar to him as his native tongue, lessons given gratis by the brawling, shouting, yelling, swearing boatmen, as he threaded his way through the crowded fleets of lorchas, lighters, junks, flower-boats, police boats, and sampans that make up the noisy babel so delightful to ears Oriental. Thus, at the first blush of dawning manhood, Wells Williams took his station on the remotest frontier of the foreign field, the most unpromising in the wide world, a simple printer, without collegiate, theological, or medical education, to become, through his own industry, the eminent "self-educated" author of works that should enlighten the Christian world and smooth the pathway of the hundreds who should come after.

At his advent all things were as they had been for a century. China was a sealed country. The three immortal pioneer missionaries, Messrs. Morrison, (1807,) Milne, (1813,) Medhurst, (1817,) and a score of successors, unable to penetrate the barrier, had expended their forces on the emigrant overflow of the Malayan Archipelago. The first American in the field, Elijah C. Bridgman, (1830,) could do no more at Canton than Morrison, the first Englishman, had done twenty-three years before. He could neither teach nor preach. He could only, in a sort of stealthy way, print books for circulation. In 1832 New York sent him a press, and in 1833 an enthusiastic young printer, well versed in his art. Missionary effort of every kind was

opposed and restrained by three hostile forces, the native authorities, the narrow East India Company, and the Romish priests at Portuguese Macao. In 1834 the monopolizing Company was dissolved, and the great and good Dr. Morrison died. At that time Bridgman and Williams were the only missionaries left on Chinese soil. The Chinese Christian Church had, as yet, no being. Books, teachers, translations, and the printing-office were the only resort of this brace of lonely workers. To these they were shut up, and, of these, during the ten years that intervened before the opening of the treaty ports, they made diligent use. With his new printing-press, in 1832, the indefatigable Bridgman began a monthly called the "Chinese Repository," of which he and Williams were co-editors till its winding up with the twentieth volume in 1851. In 1835–36, Williams spent seventeen months at Macao, completing Medhurst's Hak-ke-en Dictionary, his first, but by no means his last, work in the lexicon line. As a pleasant change to four years of solitary routine he was invited, in 1837, to go in the American ship "Morrison"—the property of the benevolent patrons of missions, Messrs. Olyphant & Co.—to the Loo Choo Islands and Japan, to return some shipwrecked natives to their own country. The expedition was unsuccessful. Its benevolent mission was neither understood nor appreciated. The jealous natives fired upon the vessel at each of the four ports she attempted to enter. After an absence of ten months the ship returned, and the wrecked sailors were put to work, for their own support, in the printing-office of the mission. The ever-active mind of Williams seized the opportunity to learn their language, and between 1839 and 1841 he made, by their aid, an imperfect translation of Genesis and Matthew into Japanese. Between 1837 and 1844 he completed a useful manual, "Easy Lessons in Chinese," for beginners; assisted Bridgman in the preparation of his "Chrestomathy," another useful hand-book for beginners; edited the second edition of the younger Morrison's "Commercial Guide," an invaluable repertory of facts for merchants and ship-masters, and published a vocabulary in English and Chinese, which the writer found exceedingly helpful, notwithstanding its provincial syllabary, —that of the Canton dialect.

Mr. Williams was, of course, at the very center of the opium

conflict between the English and Chinese, from the stoppage of the trade on account of the pernicious drug in 1834, to the first conquest of the latter by the former in 1842; chronicled all the events of the war—1841-2—and preserved all its important papers and dispatches, both in English and Chinese, in the columns of the "Repository." In 1844, when a new order of things had been established, when Portuguese Macao had been substituted by British Hong-Kong, and when missionaries had begun to flow freely into each of the newly opened ports, Mr. Williams accepted an invitation, tendered him by the patron to whom he had dedicated his book, Gideon Nye, Jr., to make an overland passage, by way of Egypt, Palestine, and Europe, to his native land. After an interesting visit to the Holy Land, the Nile, Italy, and Paris, (where he purchased many useful works on China,) he sailed from England to the United States, arriving in New York, October, 1845. At that period great interest had been aroused by the recent wars in China, of which he availed himself by delivering a course of lectures on China, the proceeds of which were devoted to the purchase of a font of Chinese metallic type cast for the mission in Berlin, Germany. These lectures grew to volumes, and at the suggestion of friends, and by their munificent aid, he wrote out and published the first edition of "The Middle Kingdom." (New York, 1848.)

On November 27, 1847, at the mature age of thirty-five, Mr. Williams married, at Plattsburg, the eldest daughter of John Walworth, brother of Chancellor Reuben H. Walworth, by whose nomination the author of "The Middle Kingdom" was made honorary Doctor of Laws by Union College in 1848. They sailed for China on June 1, 1848, and arrived in Canton in September following. In 1851 he brought back the printing-office to Canton, wound up the "Repository," and commenced the publication of his "Tonic Dictionary of the Canton Dialect," the product of eight years' labor, a manual which the writer of this article found very useful, though hampered by a syllabic dress foreign to the Foochow dialect.

In 1853, he was invited to accompany as interpreter Commodore Perry in his expedition to open Japan, returning in August, 1854, to carry his Dictionary through the press and publish a fourth edition of the "Commercial Guide," a manual

which has reached a sixth edition, and is still of inestimable value.

In September, 1855, after twenty-two years' connection with the missionary work, Dr. Williams followed the example of Morrison and Gützlaff, and accepted a secular position, that of secretary and interpreter to the American Legation in China, an office which he held for the next twenty-one years—years the most eventful of any in the history of the Chinese Empire. During his official relation he twice visited the United States, in 1860 and 1875. Unable to be quiet, in the intervals of official duty he compiled, in eleven years, an "Anglo-Chinese Dictionary," published in 1874. In 1876, after a residence of forty-three years in China, he resigned and returned to his native land, to accept the professorship of Chinese in Yale in 1877, and to be made President of the American Bible Society in 1882—a merited compliment to one who had done so much for the circulation of the Scriptures in heathen lands.

"The Middle Kingdom."

To the preparation of his survey of China, its social life and institutions, Mr. Williams brought twelve years of study and intercourse with the Chinese on their own soil; to the revisal he brought the accumulated material of over forty years' intimate acquaintance with the empire from Hong-Kong to the Great Wall. Without the power of judicious discrimination and selection, profusion of knowledge may be a hinderance rather than a help to a writer. Doolittle's "China" is tediously inventorial in its minuteness. Ten years of itemized experiences of his residence at Foochow were far less interesting to the general reader than a rapid twenty-page sketch of a few weeks' visit to Pekin. Nevertheless, his information, "detailed and reliable," had the advantage that a local history has over a general account, which is apt to become vague and barren as it grows in extent and volume. Dr. Williams deprecates the necessity of condensing so much into such confined space, and says, "Future writers will, I am convinced, after the manner of Richtofen, Yule, Legge, and others, confine themselves to single or cognate subjects rather than attempt such a comprehensive synopsis as is here presented." Edkins says truly, in the introduction to his "Religion in China," "There

have been many books written in that country with a chapter on each thing. It is this that renders them unsatisfactory to those who seek information on some particular subject." Shoals of works of the "My First Impressions" and "What I Saw" order have appeared during the century from the *attachés* of embassies, consular officials, army officers, transient travelers, who wrote up China from what they "saw" in a cart-ride from Tientsin to Pekin, a boat-trip on the Woo-Sung at Shanghai, a ride in a sedan-chair through the streets of Foochow, or a week or two among the merchants at Canton or Hong-Kong.

Doolittle alludes to a common vice of writers, that of generalizing from particulars; inferring the character of a whole people from that of special localities; affirming in general terms of the Chinese, as a nation, what is true only of the people in the part of the country where the writer made his observation: as if one were to describe as general and European every thing he saw in Italy, when he had seen no other nation of that continent but the Italian. Until within the last forty years the only point of contact with the nation was Canton, and that on the verge of the river-bank outside of the city. The Cantonese differ from the Fo-Kienese and Pekinese, in language and local customs, as much as Italians differ from Spanish, or French from Spanish and Portuguese.

Book-knowledge of the Celestial Empire has steadily drifted westward from the days of Marco Polo, Sir John Mandeville, and the Jesuit fathers. Native authors are as voluminous as the German to those who can read them. The resources of the author of "The Middle Kingdom" were ample, and increased a hundred-fold after the opening of the empire, and especially by residence at the capital. The only adverse criticism we recollect to have seen was that of the "London Athenæum," in 1848: "These volumes have little that is novel in them"—a backhanded compliment to the wider knowledge of the self-complacent critic, who is nothing if he cannot claim superiority in the line of the work he reviews. It has been the pleasant occupation of some idle hours to compare the revised and original editions of this work of Dr. Williams. The two lie on different sides of the dividing zone between the old order of things and the new. The events of a generation have sufficed to antiquate the original edition of "The Middle

Kingdom," and to make it read like a Staunton and Barrow commemoration of the M'Cartney expedition of the last century.

In 1833, with no hint of Professor Maury, the "Morrison" rolled leisurely over the seas with the average speed of a canal boat, five miles an hour, making the voyage from New York to Canton in a hundred and thirty-two days. Quarter of a century later, Liverpool clippers, formed for swiftness and schooled by wind and current charts and sailing directions, bowled over oceans at the rate of five leagues per hour, to and from the Australian gold fields. Each was a type of its own times, one related to the loitering stage-coach, the other to the lightning express.

In 1844, Williams coasted along Southern Asia to Bombay in a sailing vessel. The magnificent line of the Peninsular and Oriental steamers was not yet. In 1848, our ocean navigation, telegraphy, and photography were in their infancy. Most of the social events that have re-created America, remolded the policies and theologies of every European State, sent gleams of light athwart Africa from Cape Colony and the Congo to the desert and pyramids, that have stirred Asia out of the lethargy of ages from the Levant to the Yellow Sea, and forced the unwilling millions of India, China, and Japan into the mighty march of modern thought and progress, have happened since the first volume of "The Middle Kingdom" was given to the world. It was needful that the revise should reflect all these wonderful changes.

The opening chapters, on the geography of the empire, needed little alteration. The physical features and civil boundaries of the land remain much as they were when the Jesuits made their ten years' survey (1708 to 1718) and presented their completed map to the emperor. For coast surveys the Chinese are indebted to foreign hydrographers, chiefly to Horsburgh, in the employ of the East India Company at the commencement of the century, and later, to Captain Collinson, of the Royal Navy of Great Britain. Heathenism erects no light-houses, and the eastern seas have been largely charted by the wrecks that have become at once expensive and mournful beacons of concealed coral ledges. In 1848, Williams's description of that wonder of the world, the Great Wall, north of Pekin, was written from books and hearsay. In the revised

edition he describes from what he has seen. On page 30, vol. i, we read:

The impression left upon the mind of the foreigner on seeing this monument of human toil and unremunerative outlay is respect for a people that could in any manner build it. Standing on the peak at Old North Gate, one sees the cloud-capped towers extending away over the declivities in single file both east and west, until dwarfed by miles and miles of skyward perspective as they dwindle into minute piles, yet stand with solemn stillness where they were stationed twenty centuries ago, as though condemned to wait the march of time till their builders returned. The crumbling dike at their feet may be followed, winding, leaping across gorges, defiles, and steeps, now buried in some chasm, now scaling the cliffs and slopes, in very exuberance of power and wantonness, as it vanishes in a thin shadowy line at the horizon. Once seen, the Great Wall of China can never be forgotten.

The full description of the capital, Pekin, is enlarged from fifteen pages to twenty-two, many passages entirely re-written, others inserted, and the whole enriched by the addition of two fine engravings—a Lamaistic monument, and one of the gates of the city surmounted by frowning watch-towers. The notice of the emperor's beautiful Summer Palace is supplemented with the remark, "But all this was swept away by the British and French troops in 1860, and the ruins still remain to irritate the officials and people of Pekin against all foreigners."

The description of the celebrated porcelain tower of Nankin, which the Tai-pings blew up and razed to the ground in 1856, is re-written, partly omitted and substituted by the account given by Dr. Charles Taylor, an American missionary who visited the structure in 1852, and left a full account of his observations, to be found in his "Five Years in China," issued by the Southern Methodist Publishing House, (Nashville, 1860.)

It was to have been raised to an altitude of 329 feet and of thirteen stories, but only nine were built. Careful measurement gave 261 feet as its height, 8½ feet thickness at top and 12 feet at base, where it was 96 feet and 10 inches in diameter. The facing was of bricks made of porcelain clay, and the prevailing color green, the wood-work curiously carved and richly painted, the many-colored tiles and bricks highly glazed, giving the building a gay and beautiful appearance, greatly heightened in reflected sunlight. When new it had 150 bells and 140 lamps. The wanton destruction of a building like this goes far to explain the absence of all old or great edifices in China.—Vol. i, p. 103.

The description of the commercial city Canton is much fuller than was possible in 1848. One of the most interesting of the newly inserted passages relates to the celebrated Examination Hall:

> Similar in size and arrangement to those in other cities, it is 1,330 feet long, 583 wide, and covers over 16 acres. The total number of cells is 8,653. Each cell (designed to isolate a single examinee) is 5 ft. 9 in. deep by 3 ft. 8 in. wide; grooves in the wall admit a plank or two for a seat and table by day and a bed by night. Halls, courts, lodging-rooms, and eating-houses of the examiners with their assistants and copyists, with thousands of waiters, printers, underlings, and soldiers. At the biennial examnation the total number of students and attendants in the hall reaches nearly 12,000 men.—Vol. i, pp. 166, 167.

At page 551, vol. i, may be seen a view of a pictured section of the Examination Hall at Pekin, which is similar in construction to those at Foochow, Canton, and all the provincial capitals. Vol. ii, p. 523, presents the reader with a fine view of the wall of Canton, from a point of view which the writer reached in 1861, but which no foreigner had ever seen till the final occupation of the city by the combined French and English forces at the beginning of 1858. Hong-Kong, which in 1845 had 25,000 inhabitants, now has 130,000, a large proportion of whom are Chinese.

The chapter relating to census and statistics is not greatly changed. In 1881, the Chinese Customs' Reports gave the population at 380,000,000. Owing to the author's predilection for natural sciences, his sixth chapter, on the "Natural History of China," was peculiarly full and interesting in the first edition. We are not surprised, however, to read in his preface, page x:

> Foreign students of natural history have, by their researches in every department, furnished material for more extensive and precise description than could possibly have been gathered two score of years ago. The sixth chapter has, therefore, been almost wholly re-written, and embraces as complete a summary of this wide field as space would allow or the general reader tolerate. The specialist will recognize the fact that this rapid glance serves rather to indicate how immense and how imperfectly explored is this department, than to describe what is now known.

Fifty-six pages in the former work are increased to eighty-four in the new edition, and this section is enriched by some

choice specimens of landscape scenery that show that the photographer has been abroad.

In so staid a government as China there is not to be anticipated any such changes in laws and their administration as can be effected by almost any legislative body in this uneasy country, or by any session of Congress or Assembly, and hence the alterations in these two chapters do not go beyond a few omissions and additions.

Chapter IX, devoted to schools, books, teachers, studies, competitive examinations, and literary degrees, is an attractive one. School-books—the books first put into the hands of children and youth—exert such a powerful influence in the formation of character that the author felt impelled to devote ten pages in both old and new edition to the discussion of six elementary works of this description. Having no alphabet, the beginner's first work is to learn, by sheer force of memory, some thousands of separate characters, each of which is a word of one syllable, that may become a part of a compound word when two or three of them are strung together to form a compound word, as fire-wheel-ship, steam-boat; self-come-fire, friction match; united-people-country, United States. These word characters, arranged in vertical columns, reading downward, and commencing at the right, where we leave off, are totally destitute of inflection. A familiar story lesson of our old Webster spelling-book would be arranged, trimetrically, as follows. Begin at the right:

quick	grass	old	pelt	old	say	on	one
come	no	man	him	man	come	he	old
down	good	say	grass	say	down	tree	man
beg	pelt	word	make	fetch	chap	steal	find
man	he	no	chap	you	say	he	rude
pardon	stone	good	laugh	down	wont	fruit	boy

Such is the arrangement of the initial learn book, called "The Three Character Classic," which begins with the nature of man and the necessity and modes of education, instead of the simple fables and stories put into the hands of western children. Filial and practical duties are inculcated by precept and example, followed by a synopsis of the various branches of learning, after the favorite Chinese fashion of numerical series,

three powers, four seasons, five virtues, seven passions, ten social duties. Book two is "The Hundred Surnames," a list of the family or clan names in common use in the empire. "Of eighty-three common words pronounced 'ke' only six are clan names, and so it is necessary to have these very familiar in the common intercourse of life." Hence the importance of their early study. The third is "The Thousand Character Classic," of which no two characters are alike in form or meaning. What a tax on the infant memory! The fourth is "Odes for Children."

> It is of the utmost importance to educate children;
> Do not say that your families are poor,
> For those who can handle well the pencil,
> Go where they will, need never ask for favors.
>
> A passage for the sea has been cut through mountains,
> And stones have been melted to repair the heavens:
> In all the world there is nothing that is impossible;
> It is the head of man alone that is wanting resolution.

The fifth is "Canons of Filial Duty," a record of conversation between Confucius and a disciple on the principles of filial piety, a theme on which Chinese writers are forever harping. The sixth school-book is the "Juvenile Instructor," which treats of the first principles of education; duties owed to selves and kindred; wise sayings of eminent men, wise maxims, and eminent examples.

The great influence which these six school-books have had is owing to their formative power on youthful minds. A large proportion of youth never go beyond them, for want of time, means, or desire. They are really here furnished with the kernel of their best literature.

On the Chinese system of competitive examinations for literary honors, where a youth graduates to what roughly corresponds to our A.B. in his own county, a subsection like one of our congressional districts; A.M. at the provincial or State capital, at the severe triennial examination; and LL.D. at the national capital, Dr. Williams submits a few notes, characterized by the discernment that pervades all his selections. We append a few scattered extracts:

Not one in a score of graduates ever obtains an office; not one in a hundred of competitors ever gets a degree; but they all

belong to the literary class and share in its influence, dignity, and privileges. These unemployed *literati* form a powerful middle class, whose members advise work-people who have no time to study, and aid their rulers in the management of local affairs. This class has no badge of rank, and is open to every man's highest talent and efforts. Talent, wealth, learning, influence, all have full scope for their greatest efforts in securing the prizes. If these prizes had been held by a tenure as slippery as they are at present in the American Republic, or obtainable only by canvassing popular votes, the system would surely have failed, for "the game would not have been worth the candle."

Chinese institutions of learning have opened the avenues of rank to all, by teaching candidates how to maintain the principles of liberty and equality. All these institutions need, to secure and promote the highest welfare of the people, is faithful execution in every department of government. The Chinese seem to have attained the great ends of human government in as high a degree as it is possible for man to go without the aids of revelation. Its truths, its rewards, its hopes, and its stimulus to good acts are yet to be received among them. The course and results of the struggle between the old and the new in the land of Sinim will form a remarkable chapter in the history of man.

The chapter on "Language" is probably as little altered as any in the new book. One of the most copious languages in the world to the eye, Chinese is one of the most meager to the ear. The following English sentence will illustrate it: "Wright—write rite right"—a complete sense to the eye, but conveying no idea to the ear, but a meaningless repetition of the same word. The sameness of sound to the ear is carried to a fearfully perplexing extent in Chinese. The number of separate syllables is exceedingly limited. The entire number of vocables in any dialect as modified by initials, finals, and tones amount only to a few hundreds. But

this paucity of vocables or monosyllabic words is largely compensated in the spoken dialects by the very frequent union of two or more words, virtually forming polysyllables, to express simple ideas. Thus the number of words is increased to several thousands, which give the Chinese language a richness and variety of expression but little, if any, inferior to that of alphabetic languages.

In the Foochow dialect forty-six characters are called Ching, fifty Ping, sixty Ling, seventy Sing, seventy-five Ing, samples of what obtains throughout this dialect and all others of this curious language. While the acquisition of such a world of

written characters (44,400 in Kanghi's Dictionary) is the work of laborious years for the eye and memory, the vocal language is easy of acquisition. The Fo-ke-en tongue has about twenty-five sounds in its vocalization where the English has forty, none so hard as our guttural *g*, or aspirated *th*, which Europeans, and even our own native-born negroes, change to *d*. The learner in Chinese has to master the German *ü*, the French *ieu*, the initial *ng*, and the tones on the correct use of which the meaning of words and sentences so much depends. In learning English, Chinese organs find it difficult to curl themselves about the *r* for which they universally substitute *l* in the jargon that is called Pigeon English, used in trade at Canton, to which Dr. Williams makes repeated reference in his volumes. Not stopping to acquire the Chinese, and impatient of teaching the natives correct speech, the necessities of trade for two hundred years have created a barbarous jargon or lingo, which, comically enough, the Chinese suppose to be good English till better instructed. Curious specimens of this gibberish are found at page 832 of volume i and 402 of volume ii. The interested reader will find Longfellow's "Excelsior" *in extenso* in this droll "chow-chow" in General Rusling's "Across America," page 302. Dr. Williams concludes the chapter with some sensible remarks, page 25:

> A knowledge of the Chinese language is a passport to the confidence of the people, and when foreigners generally learn it the natives will begin to divest themselves of their prejudices and contempt. As an inducement to this study, the scholar and philanthropist have the prospect of benefiting and informing, through it, vast numbers of their fellow-men; of imparting to them that which will elevate their minds, purify their hearts, instruct their understandings, and at the same time make them acquainted with the discoveries in science, medicine, and arts among western nations.

Consul Medhurst, in his "Foreigner in Far-Kathay," thinks the Protestant missionaries have made a mistake in confining their preaching and publications too exclusively to the local *patois* of the language, securing the attention of the lower classes, but exciting the contempt of the higher and more scholarly. It may be the mission of Christianity in eastern Asia to elevate these local languages into vehicles for future literature, as the translation of the Bible into vernacular did

for the priest-despised *patois* of Europe a few centuries ago. In China, as elsewhere, Christianity will take its first root among the lowly, and not among the proud and Pharisaic *literati;* it will begin in homes and among women and children, and not among the merchant adventurers of Australia, the Malay Archipelago, or California. Its language every-where is not that of literature and commerce, but that of the hearth and heart. By and by literature will condescend to borrow from that which it originally despised.

Since the chapter on "Classical Literature" was published in 1848, Dr. Legge has given to the world his extended editions of the classics, to the translating and editing of which he devoted his life-work in the intervals of missionary labor. For the old quotations Dr. Williams has wisely substituted some pages from Legge's translation of the "Book of Odes" done into English verse.

For specimens of the ability of the ancient Chinese, contemporary with the Jewish Moses or Isaiah, to make verse, we must refer the reader to pages 638–40 of the first volume of the revise. One extract of two verses is especially severe upon a female mischief-maker in the court of King Yu. The first reads:

> "To woman's tongue let scope be given,
> And step by step to harm it leads;
> Disorder does not come from heaven,
> 'Tis woman's tongue disorder breeds."

Numerous stanzas among the odes show the fairer side of the female character, and go far to neutralize the foregoing, giving the same contrasts in womanly disposition that were portrayed by Solomon in the same age. In the edition of 1848 the life of Mencius was given before that of Confucius; in 1883 these names and the accompanying biographical notices are restored to their chronological order, not a solitary instance of judicious transposition in the making up of the later volumes.

The sketches of the lives of the two great philosophers, Koong and Meng, absurdly written in English, or rather Latin, Confucius and Mencius, (names made of the surname and title combined, like Smithmister and Brownprofessor,) are enriched with incidental touches and enlarged.

Turning the leaves rapidly, and examining cursorily several

of the succeeding chapters, we notice valuable additions made from wider study, rarer opportunity, and fresher knowledge to the manufacture of the porcelain for which China has been so long famous, as well as to those other articles of world-wide commercial importance, tea and silk. On pages 87, 88, we find a paragraph worth quoting because it shows the ease and readiness with which the Chinese accept membership in the numerous Christian denominations, representing twenty different missionary societies.

> One characteristic feature of Chinese society cannot be omitted in this connection, namely, its tendency to associate. . . . The people crystallize into associations, in town and country, in buying and selling, in studies, fights, politics—women as well as men.

Every one must belong to a *ho-ey*, and when converted to Christianity it is to join the Methodist Ho-ey, or the Presbyterian Ho-ey, or the Episcopal Ho-ey, whose profound differences in theologies and forms seem no greater to them than those of the industrial associations into which all society is divided.

> In trade, capitalists associate to found banks; little farmers club together to buy an ox; pedlers to get the custom of a street; porters to monopolize the loads of a ward; chair-bearers to furnish all the sedans for a town; even the beggars are allotted to special streets, by the *ho-ey*, and driven off another's beat if they encroach.

Chinese art and symbolism are fully treated and enriched by cuts, one of which depicts the ravages of the thunder-god, encircled by lightning and flames, almost the only Chinese mythological deity portrayed, like the unscriptural angels of Christian painters and artists, with wings.

The chapters on Religion and Missions are of pre-eminent interest to the readers of this review. Full exhibits of the religions of the empire have been given in special and separate treatises by veteran missionaries, Medhurst, Legge, Edkins, Martin, and others. No less than eight religions are tolerated, and flourish side by side, some of them intertwined, single individuals being at once Confucianists in theory and Buddhists in practice. There is the indigenous or State religion, Confucianism, Taouism, Buddhism, Judaism, Mohammedanism, Romanism, Protestantism. The masses are Buddhists, the

product of ten centuries of unremitting missionary labor from India.

The State religion, the worship of Shan-te, supreme ruler, by the emperor in person, a wonderful pageant, is brilliantly illustrated by a frontispiece copied from a Chinese painting.

Legge's "Taouism" ("Religions of China," Scribners, 1881) is later and more satisfactory than Williams, and he who wishes fuller accounts of Buddhism must seek it in Edkins, Legge, Spence Hardy, Barth's superb manual of the "Religions of India," (Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston, 1882,) and Arnold's "Light of Asia," "the fervid lines of which," says Dr. Williams, "take one quite into the realm of fable, and make us wish that the Confucian analects and their matter-of-fact detail could have been imitated by the disciples of Siddharta." Confucianism should be saint-worship, (very distasteful it would have been to the political reformer and moralist and non-religionist;) yet the presence of fifteen hundred temples seems to savor of the divine. As the tithes of the ancient State religion and the ten commandments of Buddhism point to an analogy with Judaism, so the seventy special disciples of Confucius and the three thousand converts to his system remind us of the seventy of the Saviour and the three thousand baptized on the day of Pentecost. The real religion of the Chinese Dr. Williams thinks is "the worship of deceased ancestors."

> The doctrines of Confucius and the ceremonial of the State religion exhibit the speculative, intellectual dogmas of the educated *literati* and thinkers; the tenets of Lau-tsz, and the sorcery and incantations of his followers, show the mystic and marvelous part of popular belief, while Buddhism takes hold of the common life, offers relief in times of distress, and escape from future hell by a round of prayers. But the heart of the nation reposes more upon the rites offered at the family shrine to the living divinities who preside in the hall of ancestors than to all the rest.—Vol. ii, p. 236.

Christian missions in China, so far as we know, commenced with the Nestorians in the seventh century. The Romanists have put forth herculean efforts to missionize the empire, from the thirteenth century down. The period of their special dominance embraced one hundred and fifty years, from Ricci in 1582 to 1736. "Few missions in pagan countries have been more favored with zealous converts, or more aided and coun-

tenanced by the rich and noble, than the early papal missions to China." Yet, through the constant disputes between the followers of Loyola, Dominic, and Francis, more virulent than any between various denominations of Protestants, they managed to get themselves excluded from the empire.

They evidently decreased in numbers and influence until the new era inaugurated by the treaties of 1858.

Williams gives statistics as follows, reported by themselves, which we have taken the liberty to tabulate:

	1820.	1839.	1846.	1866.	1870.	1881.
Bishops.....	6	8	12	20		41
Co-adjutors.....	2		8			
Foreign Missions.	23	57	80	238	254	664
Native Priests...	80	114	90	237	138	559
Converts.....	215,000	303,000	400,000	363,000	404,530	1,092,818

Papal fashion, the total number of converts includes all the members of the families who give outward adherence to the rites of the Church. The tale of converts is doubtless swelled by including infants, surreptitiously—we might add, superstitiously—baptized, in a dying state, by sisters of charity, as at Tientsin, where their anxiety to get infant neophytes led to methods that provoked the jealousy and suspicion of the natives, and inflamed them to such a degree as to result in a mob, and the bloody massacre of twenty foreigners, including the French consul, and as many natives, nurses, teachers, and servants.

The success of Protestant missions since 1844 is decidedly gratifying. We miss the well-thumbed list of missionaries sent out by fourteen Protestant societies between 1807 and 1849, one hundred and twelve in number, found on pages 375, 376 of the second volume, old edition. In the revise, we have, at pages 360–62, the treaty articles which secured the toleration of religion and the protection of Christians. In a letter to the writer, dated February 6, 1878, Dr. Williams refers with pardonable pride and due thankfulness to God, to the "opportunity he had to get the toleration article into the United States treaty, whence it was transferred into the British treaty." On page 362, in a foot-note, he animadverts with characteristic candor and severity upon Article VI of the French treaty, 1860, in relation to the restoration of property once owned by the Romanists, which closes with the clause, "It is

permitted to French missionaries to rent and purchase land in all the provinces, and to erect buildings thereon at pleasure."

"This sentence," says Dr. Williams, "is not contained in the French text of the convention. The surreptitious insertion of this important stipulation in the Chinese text makes it void. The procedure was unworthy of a great nation like France, whose army environed Pekin when the convention was signed."

In carrying out the details of this obnoxious article so much injustice and violence were exhibited by native Romanists, supported by missionaries, in claiming lands alleged to have belonged to them as far back as the days of Ricci and the Ming dynasty, and forcing owners and occupants to yield them without any or sufficient compensation, that riots and hatreds arose in many parts of China. Temples, houses, and shops that had been in the legal possession of natives for one or two centuries were claimed under this stipulation, and they forcibly resisted the surrender. The discontent became so great that the French minister at last issued a notice about 1872 that no more claims of this kind would be received from the missionaries, and further complaints ceased.—Vol. ii, p. 362.

No less than six complete translations of the Bible into the Chinese have been made during this century. Numerous partial translations have been made in the local dialects, dictionaries multiply, and the means for acquiring the language and instructing the natives are manifold what they were thirty years ago. In 1877 a conference of Protestant missionaries was held at Shanghai, in the spirit of the union and catholicity that characterize the present age, at which one hundred and twenty-six men and women, connected with twenty different bodies, assembled to discuss their common work in its various departments. At that conference it was reported that the whole number of missionary stations was 92; outstations, 532; organized Churches, 318; wholly self-supporting, 18; partially self-supporting, 264; male communicants, 8,308; female, 5,207; total of Church members, 13,515; pupils in schools, day, boarding, and Sunday, over 8,000; ordained pastors and preachers, 73; assistant preachers, 519; churches, 246; chapels, 457; hospital patients, 135,381; medical students, 33; contributions by native Christians, $9,571. The total number of men who had joined the Protestant missions was 484. The

total number of persons then engaged in active work in China was 473; of these 210 belonged to ten American societies; 242 to thirteen British, and 26 to two German societies. Of the women, 172 were the wives of missionaries, and 63 unmarried. In conclusion, Dr. Williams pays merited compliment to the deceased members of the missionary corps.

The Chinese are eminently a trading people, and the chapter on commerce has been extended by the author somewhat in the measure commensurate with its importance. Opium still occupies its prominent place, notwithstanding the frantic but futile efforts of the government to get rid of it. The import of it was legalized in 1858 under compulsion by the government, which no longer prevents the cultivation of the poppy, and its growth has rapidly extended through the provinces. The average amount of import of this destructive drug Dr. Williams puts at sixty millions of dollars a year. A full exhibit of the traffic in all its hideousness and iniquity, from the pen of Dr. S. L. Baldwin, will be found in the October number of this Review for 1883. Full tables of the amount and value of foreign trade with China, with exports of teas and merchandise, are brought down to 1881.

Out of the concluding chapters of the edition of 1848 not less than twenty pages have been omitted, and half as many substituted in their place. They contained a full and succinct account of the origin and progress of the war, which, as Dr. Williams says, "was looked upon by the Chinese, and will always be looked upon by the candid historian, and known to posterity, as the Opium War." He regards it as "matter of lasting regret that the impression has been left on the minds of the Chinese people that the war was an Opium War, and waged chiefly to uphold commerce in that pernicious and destructive article."

Chapter XXIV is a condensed account of that singular episode in Chinese history—the Tai-ping rebellion. It is a romantic story, and as reliable as it is romantic. It is impossible to compress into a few pages that which has occupied volumes. Nevertheless, we know of no account more succinct and accurate than that given to the general reader in the twenty-fourth chapter of "The Middle Kingdom." A disappointed Canton scholar, failing to become a literary graduate,

gets a smattering of Bible doctrines through missionary tract distribution, becomes a sort of convert, abjures idolatry, burns temples, smashes idols, has visions, works cures, preaches, baptizes, keeps the Sabbath, gathers adherents by the thousand, becomes possessed of the idea that he is chosen of Heaven to overthrow the Tartar dynasty that has lasted for two centuries, begins in 1851 his northwardly march, takes capital after capital of the provinces that lie in his route, till within little over a year he is in possession of Nankin, the old capital of the empire, on the mighty "Child of the Ocean"—the Yang-tze-kiang. One of his lieutenants marches through several of the provinces north of that till he gets within seventy or eighty miles of Pekin. Why the insurgents did not rush upon the capital and seize the reins of power when the government was crippled in 1858, and again in 1860, by the foreign powers, is only explained on the supposition that the leader was not equal to his position—that it is easier to disorganize and destroy than to build up and create. How the King of Universal Peace held communications with the Father Almighty, called himself the brother of Jesus Christ, and inquired whether the Virgin Mary had not a virgin sister whom he could marry and add to his harem of wives, need not be recounted here. Neither can we dwell upon the attitude of England, hastening, in 1861, to recognize the Southerners as belligerents, and at the same time assisting to squelch the Tai-pings as rebels, bringing the rebellion to a summary and speedy end in 1864 by the agency of one of her own lieutenants, the famous Colonel Gordon. All this reads like romance in the pages of Dr. Williams, who concludes the chapter thus:

> The once peaceful and populous parts of the nine great provinces through which the hordes of Tai-ping passed have hardly yet begun to be returned to their previous condition. Ruined cities, desolated towns, heaps of rubbish, still mark their course from Kwang-Si to Tientsin, a distance of two thousand miles. Their presence was an unmitigated scourge, attended by nothing but disaster from beginning to end, without the least effort on their part to rebuild what had been destroyed, to protect what was left, or to repay what had been stolen. Wild beasts roamed at large over the land after their departure, and made their dens in the deserted towns; the pheasant's whir resounded where the hum of busy populations had ceased, and weeds and jungle covered the ground once tilled with patient industry. Millions

on millions of wealth was irrecoverably lost and destroyed, and misery, sickness, and starvation were the lot of the survivors. It has been estimated by foreigners living at Shanghai, that from 1851 to 1865, fully twenty millions of human beings were destroyed in connection with the Tai-ping rebellion.

In 1853 the hopes of missionaries and of the Christian world were high, because of the professed Christian character of the revolutionists. They were doomed to disappointment. Chaplain Hobson, the Bishop of Victoria, and many others, opined that the Chinese Empire was crumbling to pieces, and that a new dynasty would be erected on the ruins that would tolerate Christianity, and put renewed China into the family of nations. British and French cannon were the missionaries destined to effect this great and much-desired change. Yet the Tai-ping movement was not without its blessings, some of which Edkins points out: the dissemination of even imperfect ideas of Christianity; the dispelling of the idea of the infallible and divine character of the emperor as the son of Heaven; and, above all, the gratitude created in the minds of the Imperialists by the timely aid afforded in the hour of the empire's dire necessity.

We cannot commend or approve the rage of the Manchu rulers who retaliated the wholesale slaughter of the troops and garrisons by the Tai-pings by decapitating rebels by platoons. In 1861 we looked with shuddering interest on the little square "execution ground" in the city of Canton, where Yek cut off seventy thousand heads in one year—Williams says "a hundred thousand in fourteen months." The second war grew out of the interference of the Chinese with a vessel carrying the British flag, precipitated by a "fiery" consul* and a "conceited" Hong-Kong governor.† It resulted in a final raid by French and British upon Pekin, the complete humiliation of the Chinese, who were forced to open their long-closed doors to receive embassadors and ministers from foreign nations on terms of perfect equality, and to send ministers to those courts in return.

On my arrival at Canton in 1833, [says Dr. Williams,] I was officially reported to the hong merchant Kingqua as a foreign devil who had come to live under his tutelage. In 1874, as secretary of the American embassy at Pekin, I accompanied Hon. B. P. Avery to the presence of the Emperor Tungchi, when the United States minister presented his letters of credence on a footing of

* Parkes. † Bowring.

perfect equality with the "son of Heaven." With two such experiences in a life-time . . . it is not strange that I am assured of a great future for the son of Heaven.

We could wish that every thing might tend in the direction of educating the Chinese nation up to its destined place in the family of nations. When the writer was in China he insisted on the benefits of teaching the natives English, and taught all who desired to learn; and had the gratification after his return to America of receiving from his last teacher a letter, written in a good hand, and in perfectly correct English. Now Anglo-Chinese schools are established at Pekin, Foochow, and elsewhere as useful adjuncts to missionary effort. It is singularly anomalous that after years of labor, several wars, and the expenditure of millions of treasure and the sacrifice of thousands of lives, to compel the Chinese to open their empire to the influx of foreigners, the American nation, with millions of miles of unoccupied territory, should be the first to inaugurate the very policy of exclusion which united nations whipped the Chinese out of!

We send word to the emperor that we wish he would keep his yellow subjects at home. He sends back word that he would be only too happy to do so, and will be doubly obliged if we will keep our merchants and missionaries off his soil, and persuade the whole race of devil barbarians to do the same. "To the Chinese mind," says Consul Medhurst, "progress represents the free introduction into the country of a pushing, self-willed, impracticable, eccentric race, whose notions and habits are at utter variance with every thing to which they have hitherto been accustomed." "The ruling and influential classes only tolerate our presence in the country, and I firmly believe they would hail the day when they could see the last foreign factorate razed to the ground and the last ship dismissed from the coast, *malgré* the loss to the national revenue and the ruin of districts dependent on our trade that would surely ensue." In the East the Chinese are the great colonizers. The Shanghai Conference of 1879 called attention to the overflow upon the Indian Archipelago, Australia, New Zealand, and the Pacific coast, and says, "It will prove a blessing or a curse, just in proportion as the frontier is cared for." "There is no hope for China in itself." Its hopes for education, enlighten-

ment and Christianity, rest with the white race, the custodian, under God, of the dark races of the globe. Hand in hand, commerce and Christianity are making the tour of the world. They are antagonistic only alone. Commerce enthrones cupidity in the place of conscience. The Chinese are a nation of traders with very little conscience. The British are a nation of shop-keepers subject to spasmodic exacerbations of conscience. As yet the conscience of the nation has never so triumphed over interest as to prevent the raising of opium by one heathen nation to debase another heathen nation in spite of the frantic remonstrances of its half-civilized rulers.

In 1877 the Chinese embassador to England put the question to Dr. Legge: "Which country, from a moral stand-point, is the better of the two, England or China?" "England," replied the patriotic Scotch doctor. The mandarin pushed back his chair, rose, strode across the room, and cried: "You say that England is better than China from a moral stand-point! Then how is it that England insists on our taking opium?"

The education of a national conscience is slow work. In the liquor trade here, and the opium trade there, individual passion and trade cupidity override conscience. Flabby politicians urge lightly the make-shift urged upon the mandarins by Sir John Davis forty years ago: "Legalize the traffic you can't control." To every form of human hurt the Framer of the moral code laid down the positive "Thou shalt not," without stopping to inquire whether a man would stint obedience or obey.

But it is time to take leave of "The Middle Kingdom," and its pious, devoted, scholarly, plain-spoken author. It would be pleasant to refer to many other things, and to quote more largely from its pages. Its treasures of Chinese bibliography are worth the price of the volumes. He enriches his work by citations from nearly two hundred authors, the names of whose works are given in the text or foot-notes. The style in which the work is gotten up, its size, illustrations, chapter headings, voluminous index, print, and binding, are all indicative of the times and reflect credit upon the publishers.

The work, as we said in the outset, is monumental. To the memory of Ward and Gordon, captains of the Ever-Victorious Force that suppressed the rebellion, the grateful Chinese will erect shrines, if not temples, and burn incense forever as to

saints or divinities. Both nations, the Chinese and American, will owe a supreme debt of gratitude to Dr. Williams for a life-long effort to create a mutual understanding and a Christian good-will that shall affect the welfare of millions.

China's second great philosopher, Mencius, said: "There is no attribute of a great man greater than his helping other men to practice virtue." And again: "A wise man is the teacher of a hundred generations."

ART. VIII. — SOME ASPECTS OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

THE declaration of the apostle, made somewhat incidentally, that the advent of Christ was at "the fullness of time," sets forth a fact of far-reaching import. Many learned men, uniting the offices of the scholar and the artist, have delighted to picture to the imagination the expectant world waiting for the Coming One: some, in the clear vision of prophecy; some, in unconscious aspirations and groanings, as they who wait for the morning, looking with untiring hope for the long-looked for deliverance; many more, caring only for their present pursuits and pleasures, but unconsciously "building better than they knew," were bringing about that order of things in human affairs which should best subserve the purposes of the divine providence respecting the establishment of Christ's kingdom among men. The incarnation took place, as to the earthward side, long ages after it was called for by the apostasy, and promised by God himself to fallen man. Nor is this long delay an altogether inexplicable mystery. A train of preparatory processes for that great event is plainly traceable; and as Christ came not only to suffer and die for man's redemption, but also to reveal God's will, and to inaugurate the dispensation of the Gospel among men, the condition in which the world should be found at and closely following his coming was a matter of the highest importance.

Among the several items enumerated by the pen of inspiration, as contained in "the mystery of godliness," is the twofold fact that it was "preached among the Gentiles" and "believed

on in the world;" and of all the wonderful things about the Gospel's career, its conquest of the Roman Empire, and its dominance of the whole western world in less than three hundred years from its first promulgation, is perhaps to human appearances the most wonderful. The purpose of this initial study respecting one of the greatest events in the promulgation of the Gospel and its acceptance—the preparation and publication of *the Epistle to the Romans*—shall be to make a survey of the situation of the world at that time. The subject is not an occult one, for scarcely to any other age has the Muse of History ever been so partial, and yet it is a very broad field, and our survey of it must be both general and hasty.

The world at that time, so far as seen either in sacred or profane history, was simply the Roman Empire. The flight of the Roman eagle was from the Euphrates to the Atlantic, and from the Danube to the Great Sahara; and there was none to challenge his authority. Roman arms then held the unwilling peoples in quiet subjection; and Roman law, which always followed in the footsteps of the conquering legions, was everywhere present, decreeing equal justice to all free subjects, and bearing the sword not in vain—not (to such) as "a terror to good works, but to the evil"—and enforcing peace and order among the (until now) hostile and belligerent nations. The Divinity that rules in human affairs had "made wars to cease;" so that even martial Rome rested from conquest and slaughter. The world as then known was a single consolidated empire, under a sole imperial power, and subject generally to the same laws; and the empire was at peace.

The career of conquest by which Rome had become mistress of the world, and its empire world-wide, had also enriched all Italy with the spoils of the vanquished nations. Gradually, through more than seven hundred years, the nations of the world had been contributing of their most valued treasures for the enriching of the city on the Tiber, and steadily, through all these years, the Roman people had been advancing in all the forms of natural greatness. Theirs were the harvests of the most distant fields; the gold and silver, the pearls and precious stones of the whole world, gravitated to the banks of the Tiber; and the arts of Egypt and Assyria and Persia, and, beyond all others, of Greece, had found their resting-place in Rome.

And with their works of art came also the artists to teach their conquerors, and to naturalize taste and culture on Italian soil. Rome itself, within its twenty miles of circumvallations, was at the time of the advent a vast aggregation of palaces, the home of luxury such as, happily for us, is unknown in our times; and all Italy was a region of villas, and gardens, and pleasure grounds, while its smaller cities rivaled the metropolis in wealth, culture, luxury, and debauchery. The cessation of wars had given opportunity for the pursuits of peace, and the Augustan age ensued, with all that we seek to express by that name; which, however, in its reality, entirely outstripped men's largest conceptions. Wealth and luxury demand the service of menials, and accordingly Rome swarmed with slaves, who made up numerically the greater proportion of her millions of peoples. These were chiefly prisoners of war; often the ablest, the most learned and cultured, of the desolated and despoiled nations; and now they served their masters with their learning and genius as scholars and artists, and in all the learned professions; and, despite their condition, they constituted a not inconsiderable social element. And besides these, there was the Roman populace—a vast multitude of idle, effeminate, and pleasure-loving men and women, who lived only to indulge their passions and lusts, and their worse than brutish impulses, and to whom the government distributed its daily dole of provisions, and for whom it maintained, at untold cost, theatrical displays, athletic sports, and gladiatorial shows. Such was the city of Rome of the first Christian century.

But in the midst of this every-where manifest material splendor—this idleness, effeminacy, and pleasure-seeking—there was no lack of learning, and of deep and broad and elevating thought. The more earnest tendencies of the period took the forms of Platonism and Stoicism, while an equally learned and scarcely less thoughtful class accepted the philosophy of the Epicureans, who, believing nothing and hoping for nothing but what might befall them in the blind happenings of fortune, made it their wisdom to seize the pleasure of the passing hour, regardless alike of the claims of an ideal right or the recompenses of the absolutely uncertain future. The Stoics were the highest type of Romans, learned, thoughtful, and proud;

worshipers of virtue according to their conception of it, sensible of the emptiness of what men usually call pleasure, with a blind intuition of the right, and of obligation to conform to its demands, and thoroughly possessed of an egoistical contempt for the vulgar herds of humanity. This people were without a properly defined religious faith; their god was little more than an unknown force, and the future life was for them simply an aspiration and a dream, and man himself was in effect only an atom drifting helplessly upon the flood of the ages, without the power to choose his way or to determine his own destiny, but wholly subject to FATE. The Platonists were Grecian rather than Roman, as to the source of their doctrines, and also as to their modes of thinking, but their school had become widely established in Rome. They were idealists, affecting especially subjective meditations and speculations. They were theists, because they inferred, logically, that existence implies an originating cause, and therefore before all existences must be an ultimate First Cause, which they named GOD. But because he was essentially unknown, and indeed unknowable, though he might be made the object of the most exalted contemplation, his distance from all conditioned things rendered him unfit to be an object of worship, and therefore their religious instincts went out to secondary divinities. Their moral ideals were dreamy, indefinite, and uncertain; so that necessarily their system was without authority over their lower impulses; yet were they self-opinionated, and in thought luxurious, selfish, and indolent, and so without moral stamina, and quite unable to redeem others.

The religion of the Roman Empire was, apart from the Jewish element, a universal idolatry, of many forms and ethnic varieties, and yet with a broad and deep unity of character. Comparative mythology readily detects this essential unity beneath the many varieties seen in various countries. Its original element was a naturalism, which was somewhat formulated in both Egypt and Syria, and being brought from both of these countries into Greece, it was there wrought into an elaborate mythology, partly in the form of philosophical symbols, but chiefly in poetic fables and stories of the exploits of the gods, which were not expected to be believed. The gods of the Grecian Olympus were essentially anthropological,

endowed with vast physical powers but without intellectual greatness, and entirely depraved morally. This was the recognized religion, as to both creed and *cultus*, of the Roman Empire; and though it was the policy of Rome to allow each conquered nation to retain its own religion, yet there was among nearly all of them substantially the same mythology and similar religious forms.

But through all this was diffused another and essentially diverse religious element. When God separated a single nation for himself, according to his covenant with Abraham, he seems to have abandoned all the rest of the world, and given them over to their own folly; and thus left to themselves they turned away from seeking after God, and become vain in their imaginations, and their foolish hearts were darkened. This was evidently one side of the process of the work of preparation for the bringing in of the Gospel, of which the history of the chosen people presented the counterpart. For two thousand years the Gentile mind had been allowed to pursue its own course, not, indeed, without providential oversight, nor absolutely without spiritual guidance, but practically it was allowed to grope its way and to work out its own designs, and the result is concisely but comprehensively summed up in the saying, "The world by wisdom knew not God." And now this godlessness of thought had run its course and matured its fruit—a deep and all-embracing darkness of mind and heart, intellectual *agnosticism*, and an overmastering moral depravity of spirit. Men had turned away from God, and made gods for themselves; and God had given them up to work out their own evil purposes; and while they thus "changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator," the deep native depravity of their hearts had opportunity to develop itself in all forms of monstrous vices and corruptions.

It is quite impossible for us, who have happily never become used to such fearful shapes of matured depravity, to form an adequate conception of the terrible moral corruption of heathen Rome during the early Christian centuries. A glance at it is given in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, but only such as to awaken inquiry rather than to clearly state the case. But the subject is not an occult one. It can be learned

not only from the extant writings of the censors and moralists of those times, but much more from its poets and satirists, its Ovids and Juvenals. Both the "polite" literature and the "high art" of these times (which as to simply artistic finish are of a very high order) when viewed as illustrations of the manners of the times attest the fearful depth of the corruption of even the most cultivated classes. On the one side stand the bloody gladiatorial games, to witness which Rome daily sent out to the Coliseum tens of thousands of her best citizens, men and women, who there found their highest delights in witnessing contests of naked men with each other or with wild beasts, where slaughters by sword or dagger or heavy blows, or by the jaws of the lions, constituted the chief points of interest, and were greeted with the loudest plaudits. On the other side may be seen some indications of the unrestrained practice of licentiousness which had become interwoven into the worship of some of their chief divinities, especially of Bacchus and Venus, in respect to which we may only remark, that they were too gross to be named, and yet they were not only done, but gloried in, by the cultivated Romans of the days of the Empire. So terrible are the evidences of the depravity of those days, that as the lapse of time bears us away from them, and better associations incline us to doubt the possibility of such deep descents into vice, the world was becoming skeptical as to the correctness of the things declared to us; but God did not allow their record to be lost. In one night one of the centers of these abominations, the beautiful city of Pompeii, was suddenly buried with a flood of ashes from Vesuvius while the flood of its daily life was in its full current; and eighteen hundred years later it has been exhumed, to show us by indubitable ocular proofs what that life was. The moral sense of even the Italy of the present day will not tolerate the sights and scenes that were then and there displayed for the public delight.

A closely guarded apartment in the Museum of Naples has been made the receptacle and hiding-place of a large class of statues and pictures taken from the ruins of Pompeii, from which all but a very few visitors are carefully excluded. No youth may look upon them because of their vileness, and no woman could see them but to be either deeply pained or fear-

fully corrupted; and yet these were the open, every-day sights prepared for the public delectation of one of the most refined cities of Italy in the first century. These things demonstrate with fearful clearness the entire compatibility of the finest esthetic culture with the grossest moral depravity; for these works of art, though too indecent to be seen or described, are among the finest specimens of ancient art, showing the genius of taste debasing herself to the service of worse than bestial depravity.

Another demonstrative illustration of the morals of the Romans at the time now under notice is seen in the picture of Roman slavery, which then comprehended a large part of the inhabitants. The baldest records of its conditions will suffice for our purpose. Roman slavery was perpetual and hereditary; it had no limit but the life of the slave, and the child inherited the condition of the parent. The slave had no protection whatever against the avarice, rage, or lust of the master, and was viewed less as a human being subject to arbitrary dominion than as an inferior animal dependent wholly on the will of his owner. The master possessed uncontrolled power of life and death over his slave. He might, and frequently did, kill, mutilate, and torture his slaves, for any or for no offense, so that the slaves were sometimes crucified from mere caprice. He might force them to become prostitutes or gladiators; and instead of the perpetual obligation of such marriages as they were allowed to contract, these unions were formed and dissolved by the master's command, and when the slaves fell sick or infirm by age there was no obligation to care for them. If we are compelled to confess that this picture has been reproduced in some of its worst features in the slavery of our times, it must also be noticed that these modern slaves were at first the lowest kind of savages, and that it became impossible to hold them as slaves except as they were savages; and better still, the Christian sentiment of the age has effectually set its mark of condemnation upon it.

Though God designed that the Jews should be a separated people, that they might conserve and perpetuate his name and worship, and also become the receptacle of his revelations, they held also important relations to the heathen world. That which was announced to Abraham, that in his seed all the nations of

the earth should be blessed, was in part verified in the history of the Jewish people. Their very isolation made them conspicuous, and drew attention to the one great truth of which they were the living witness—the name of Jehovah, the being and character of the one only and true God; and the nations of the world recognized that truth, and in not a few cases sent their offerings to Jerusalem, or became themselves worshipers at the temple. And although, as to their own land, the Jews were a hermit nation, yet both by force and by their own free choice individuals of that nation were, during a large part of their history, a felt presence in many of the principal kingdoms of the earth, often occupying high places, and in their later history they were scattered, as men of business, in almost every city. And by the nature of the case every Jew was a propagandist of his national faith. A large part of the nation were, at a comparatively early date, carried as captives into Assyria, and later another portion, including those of the kingdom of Judah, were carried to Babylonia, and strangely enough, not far from the time of the invasion of Greece by Xerxes, one Jew (Daniel) was the chief minister, another the cup-bearer, and a Jewess the consort, of the Persian monarch. Afterward, when permission was given by Cyrus for the exiles to return to their own land, only comparatively few availed themselves of the proffered favor. Jewish settlements in the far East were recognized as late as the times of the apostles. Even before the times of Alexander the Great many Jews had become domiciliated at various points in Syria and Phenicia, and both Seleucus and Antiochus established colonies of Jews, with all the rights of citizens, in their dominions; and still later they became scattered, chiefly as traders, throughout Asia Minor and Greece and Italy. It is known that in the time of the prophet Jeremiah a large number of Jews migrated to Egypt, and afterward Alexandria became a semi-Jewish capital, whence they also spread abroad into Ethiopia (Abyssinia) and along the coast of the Mediterranean Sea, in Africa. Jewish captives were taken to Rome, after some of the earlier Roman invasions of their country, but they were set free and erected into a local community by Julius Cæsar, to which large additions were made by subsequent immigrations, some of whom were in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost.

The Jewish character of those times appears to have been instinctively, and even intensely, religious. The expatriated Jews carried their religion with them into their places of sojourn, and wherever they wandered they uniformly prayed with their faces toward Jerusalem, and they were not content simply to exercise and enjoy their religion for themselves, but they were constantly striving, and not without success, to win over to it their Gentile fellow-townsmen. Some such became full proselytes—were circumcised, and so were identified with the people of God. The existence of such a class is indicated by such cases as those of the Greeks who were at the feast at Jerusalem and desired to see Jesus—of the Ethiopian eunuch, the centurion of Capernaum, and Cornelius of Cesarea, and generally by the intelligent readiness of many of the Gentiles, both the rulers and the common people, to listen to the Gospel as preached by the apostles. Evidently nearly all parts of the vast Roman Empire had become, to a greater or less extent, the homes of members of the "twelve tribes scattered abroad," and not only these had by their steady adherence to the religion of their fathers already somewhat leavened the communities in which they severally lived, but also they were present in them, ready to be influenced by the Gospel when it should be brought to them. The divine hand had placed them there, that, like leaven in the meal, they might become available for the furtherance of the Gospel.

Among those who are named as hearing and being convinced and converted by Peter's preaching on the day of Pentecost were "sojourners from Rome, both Jews and proselytes." Some of these probably returned to their distant home, and became the nucleus of the Christian society of the metropolis, which seems to have grown into form by the instinctive tendency of Christians to associate together. And these, with others who became of them, constituted those "that be in Rome," to whom St. Paul addressed his epistle.

The most conspicuous figure in the New Testament history, after its divine Head, is no doubt he who was first known as Saul of Tarsus, and later as Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles. He was himself an Israelite "of the dispersion," born at Tarsus, in Cilicia, soon after the beginning of the Christian era. His father was a citizen of Tarsus, and, in common with his

fellow-citizens, he was endowed with the franchises of Roman citizenship, which his son also inherited. He was of the tribe of Benjamin, and evidently thoroughly devoted to the Jewish religion. But he resided in a Gentile city, and neither he nor his family could escape the effects of the social atmosphere in which they lived, which through Grecian influence was decidedly liberal in its tendencies. While the home education of the boy was probably in the customs of the older and stricter Jewish school of thought, his out-door education was evidently of the spirit of the Grecian thought and culture. The schools of his native city made use of the Greek language, which quite certainly the young Hebrew spoke as his vernacular, and he also learned its literature. But this provincial Greek was not the classic dialect of Athens, and though St. Paul was clearly no mean scholar in the language of Asia Minor, it is equally evident that he was not a master of the classical Greek. It is evident, too, that his early Grecized training influenced his methods of thinking, for though his later studies brought him somewhat under the influence of the rabbinical methods, yet the traces of his earlier training may be seen in his writings. Traces also of Roman forms of thought, learned evidently in his boyhood, may also be detected in his methods.

At about twelve or thirteen years old he was taken to Jerusalem, and placed under the instruction of Gamaliel, then at the head of one of the great rabbinical schools—that of Hillel—of which he himself became the great ornament. How long he continued a learner in this school we are not told, but as he seems to have accomplished its full course, his term of instruction was probably not less than ten years. He says of himself that he profited by, or became proficient in, the Jews' religion beyond most others, but he gives no dates. He first appears on the stage at the martyrdom of Stephen, which is usually set down as occurring three or four years after the crucifixion of Christ, and then he is called a "young man;" but he was already in an advanced public station, indicating that he was not less than thirty years old. The Christian cause was already making itself felt in Jerusalem, and though there had been a few years of comparative freedom from persecution, during which time not a few of the priestly party among the Jews had accepted the Gospel, now, apparently because of the

apparent lack of deference for the ceremonial law, a violent persecution was aroused against at least the more liberal of the Christians, of which Stephen became the first victim—the stoning occurring under the oversight of "a young man named Saul." It having been also determined to bring under the discipline of the Sanhedrin certain Christians in Damascus, Saul was deputized to proceed to that city and to bring all the Christians that he might there find to Jerusalem. It was while going thither that the great event occurred which changed the whole course of his life, and by which the persecutor became the apostle.

Saul, after his conversion, remained at or near Damascus about three years, preaching Christ. Then he made a visit to Jerusalem, remaining only a few days; and evidently finding it unsafe to remain longer, he retired to his native city, Tarsus, where he remained for a while—how long, whether one year, two, or three, cannot be certainly determined—when he was called by Barnabas to aid in the great evangelistic work then proceeding at Antioch. After this his career constitutes the most considerable item in the New Testament history.

Just how early the controversy about the relation of Christian converts to the ceremonial law arose cannot be certainly determined, but we seem to see traces of it in the charges made against Stephen, on which he was condemned and stoned. The Greek and the Hebrew parties had also appeared in the Church at Jerusalem in the affair that led to the appointment of the seven deacons, one of whom, Philip, was the first to baptize a heathen convert, and another, Stephen, was put to death under a charge that he had said, "that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, [the temple—that is, its service,] and shall change the customs which Moses delivered to us," a charge which, though a perversion of the truth, no doubt had some foundation of fact. Three years later we find Saul at Jerusalem, "disputing with the Grecians, who went about to kill him," but we are not well informed whether or not these Hellenists were in any sense or degree believers, though their intimacy with the concerns of the infant Church might suggest the suspicion that they were. The truce that followed, during which the Church enjoyed a season of quiet prosperity in all parts of Palestine, was varied by Peter's affair with Cornelius,

which at first produced not a little opposition at Jerusalem, but was acquiesced in by "the apostles and brethren that were in Judea," but only after a considerable amount of "contention." After this came the affairs at Antioch, when "a great number" of uncircumcised Grecians "turned unto the Lord," and of necessity the question arose whether or not these converts must, as Christian believers, receive circumcision and submit to all the obligations of the Levitical law, which evidently some were not disposed to do, while others insisted that it was necessary. To meet this difficulty Barnabas was sent to Antioch as a kind of informal and advisory apostolical legate; but he soon became much more interested in the work of grace which he saw in progress than in any questions of the Jewish law involved in the case, and after laboring with them for some time as an evangelist, and finding the work too heavy for himself alone, he turned for assistance, not to the Church at Jerusalem, but to Saul, who was then at Tarsus, and whom he now brought to Antioch, where he continued to labor "for the space of a whole year."

The Church at Antioch was at first planted by the labors of others than the apostles, and it seems to have been from the beginning largely independent of the Church at Jerusalem, so forming a kind of non-Judaic brotherhood. Its relations to the more remote provinces of the west, and the fact that some of its converts belonged in those parts, seemed to make them its proper mission field, and accordingly Barnabas and Saul were sent out to that work, in which they traveled widely, preaching the Gospel through Asia Minor with remarkable success for two years, and then they returned to Antioch and reported their doings to the Church. The growth of the Church among the heathen was carefully noted at Jerusalem, and some overzealous persons of the mother Church, evidently without any official authorization, came to Antioch, "and taught the brethren [the Gentile converts] that, 'Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.'" Evidently a pretty sharp controversy followed, which resulted in sending a deputation to Jerusalem, headed by Barnabas and Saul, to obtain the sense of that body upon the great question at issue. The council that met to hear and determine the case, though clearly representing the mother Church, was evidently informal and

without legal power over the case, and yet its decisions could not fail to be widely effective, and the decision was clearly in favor of the Gentile party. Peace being now established, Barnabas and Saul set out on another missionary tour, going over much the same ground as before, and every-where preaching the Gospel, without requiring of their converts the observance of any part of the ceremonial law of the Jews. But the discomfited partisans of the Judaistic school did not quietly accept the decision of the "apostles and brethren" at Jerusalem, but at once, both vigorously and persistently, sought to withstand their teachings and those of the Antiochian school, and to insist on the necessity of conforming to the Mosaic law. And while, probably, the base of the movement was at Jerusalem, its emissaries were found promoting divisions in all places where the Gospel had been preached and Churches gathered.

The conflict thus raised was evidently very bitter; the opposition to the Gospel of the apostle was certainly formidable; and it was terminated only by the destruction of Jerusalem and the utter subversion of the Jewish state. Signs of the presence of this controversy and of its sharpness are seen in nearly all of St. Paul's epistles, but more especially in those to the Galatians and the Romans—the former being the more directly controversial, the latter covering the same ground of argument, but much more fully and elaborately drawing out and setting in order the great central and vital doctrines of the Christian system.

The Church at Rome, of whose founding no account is given, probably grew into form soon after the day of Pentecost, and without the presence or aid of any official or apostolical agents. Because Rome was a place of resort for people from all parts, the Church so begun would naturally become augmented, both by those coming from abroad and by conversions made on the spot. The probable date of the epistle allows not less than thirty years for its continuance and increase, and the indications are, that at the time of its writing that Church was among the most considerable in all the world; and all its conditions and environments appear to show it to have been that to which such an epistle might be addressed, though quite certainly its ultimate design extended much further than to any one place or age.

In treating of the substance of the Epistle to the Romans it is safe to assume, without argument, that it is, as it purports to be, an authentic production of the hand of the apostle Paul, and that our copy of it is genuine, substantially as originally written, and that this letter was actually sent to the Church at Rome about the usually accepted date; and with this view of the matter we have now to consider its contents.

It is a brief document, may be read through at a sitting, and yet it embodies most of the chief doctrinal points of the Gospel. It brings in nothing new, or additional to what had been before declared by divine authority. The apostle's position in this epistle is not that of a "revelator" bringing original intimations given to him by the Holy Spirit, but of a divinely illuminated expositor of things already revealed. All the doctrinal matter found in the Epistle to the Romans may be found in the older Christian documents; but they are found there in a somewhat fragmentary form, scattered through a great many books, and nowhere logically formulated. The purpose here seems to be to combine these fragmentary utterances into a symmetrical whole, with the several points so arranged as to show their mutual relations and interdependencies. This was a work not hitherto attempted; perhaps the time for it had not before come: but now evidently it was distinctly called for, and the man for the work was also at hand.

There were then three well-defined modes of thought in the world, each somewhat entering into each of the others, and all together constituting an active but unsettled state of the public mind, which demanded to be informed and satisfied. Grecian idealism, the subjective method, and the love of the beautiful, had become widely diffused, and it strongly affected the prevailing modes of thinking, and the controlling sentiments of the more cultivated especially, and the great multitude generally. It delighted to occupy itself with the most profound problems of being, and with the soul's deepest intuitions; it contemplated a world quite beyond the range of man's physical senses, and was familiar with theistical and ethical ideas; and quite naturally it mooted, though it could not answer, the great question of man's immortality and of the future life. But, as matter of fact, these higher and purer aspirations of men's minds were overborne by the prevailing

depravity of life and manners, so that they were almost entirely unavailing for practical purposes.

There was also a specifically Roman form of thought, which from its conditions was just then powerfully effective. It was almost wholly realistic, looking only to things specifically material, and considering them chiefly as forces operating according to definite modes. Hence, *power*, *dominion*, and *law* were its elements, and thoughts so formed and directed had gone forward till the whole world had been subjected to them, and under this directing spirit Roman prowess had rendered Roman dominance world-wide, and also carried with it its materialistic arts and its legislation. The Roman idea, of force acting by law, pervaded and permeated and controlled the ruling powers of the empire, and also incorporated itself in the thoughts of the whole people.

The Hebrew mind was always characteristically religious, and all its processes and manifestations were affected by that tendency; and though the political power of that people had become almost wholly extinct, yet evidently the influence of Hebrew thought was incomparably greater in the world at the time of Christ and his apostles than it had been at any previous period. The religion of the Hebrews was the very opposite of Grecian idealism, or of any form of philosophical materialism. It taught men to look beyond themselves for instruction as to both what to believe and what to do. The Hebrew mind habitually contemplated the divine Person, who, according to its conception, was infinite in his attributes and absolutely unsearchable, except as he revealed himself by his Spirit, and not only immanent in all things, but also intelligently and authoritatively present and active in human affairs. And so had he revealed himself to the Hebrew fathers, that they possessed a divinely ordained religious system of both faith and worship, and covenanted assurances of God's favor. Theirs was eminently a religion based upon faith in the invisible *Jehovah*, the one only true God; and in that simple postulate both Grecian idealism and Roman power-worship found their best possible expression, and all the world was moved by it to feel after God, "if haply they might find him."

These several and diverse mental characteristics not only existed among those who immediately represented them, but

they were brought into direct contact with each other among conditions most favorable to their mutual acting and reacting. The Roman conquerors, who uniformly came to stay, brought with them and naturalized in all places the ruling Roman ideas of power and dominion regulated by law, and these naturally became dominant among the nations whether Greeks or barbarians, Jews or Gentiles. Both the Greeks and the Jews had become migratory, and were found domiciliated in nearly every city and nation; and living thus together, at once free themselves and restrained from interfering with the freedom of others, they were permitted to affect each other as they might be able by moral and social influences. Both of these races were of the mercantile calling—a calling which uniformly tends to suppress religious peculiarities in the interest of trade —but as the Jew was less compliant than the Greek in these things, so the Jewish religious thought was the more effective. However removed from the temple and the synagogue, and however dimly he saw the promises and hopes of his nation, the Jew was a Jew still, and somehow he dimly but strongly hoped that his expectations of Israel's greatness and glories would be realized. The Greek, on the contrary, held his religious convictions very loosely, and was as to country cosmopolitan. His religion, which was at first little better than a blind fetichism, had, with the increase of intelligence, become a mere mythology, and the deeper thoughts of earlier times had faded out and given place to an almost universal negation of faith—GREAT PAN IS DEAD. And yet there was among them an unrest, and an unconscious craving for something to believe and some object worthy to be worshiped. The world seemed to be standing still and unconsciously asking, "Who will show us any good thing?"

All of these several forms of thought are clearly manifest in St. Paul's mental and spiritual habitudes. He was, under the divine providence, the creature of his times in his intellectual habits and his conceptions of spiritual things. So far as these several systems contained elements of truth, he took them into himself and assimilated them in his own spirit; and at the same time, by the action of the indwelling Spirit, he rejected from his system all forms and degrees of untruth. Any attempt to estimate the character of St. Paul as an apostle

and an evangelist of a better faith, that does not take fully into the account the specially spiritual qualifications which he brought to his work, must fatally fail; and though it is conceded that the Epistle to the Romans records no revelations by which new Christian truths or doctrines are promulgated, yet Paul's qualification for the work was nevertheless clearly an inspiration and a revelation. In him was fulfilled to an eminent degree the promise of Christ, that the divine Spirit should be imparted to guide the believers into all truth. To his quickened spiritual apprehension the things before revealed and recorded in isolated parts not only appeared in their glorious reality, but also in their mutual co-relations. It was his peculiar mission to concentrate these scattered rays of truth into a burning focus; to arrange them together into a spiritual organism, each member in its place, and altogether constituting a harmonious whole. And this is the peculiar excellence of this epistle.

To his apprehension the Gospel was a system of truth disclosing the divine Person and character, and also man's character as a creature made in God's image, but now defiled and cursed by sin, toward whom, however, God was still inclined to be merciful, and for whose salvation he had wrought out the scheme of the Gospel of which the written word is a revelation. These things he found set forth in the older Scriptures, but scattered in parts through many books, illustrated by various divinely appointed ritualistic services and religious institutions, and announced by prophets and seers, and proclaimed in great fullness and power by Christ himself. To collate these undigested materials in a symmetrical unity is the evident design of the Epistle to the Romans. It was the design of the Holy Spirit to bring the embodied truths of the Gospel within the sphere of human thought as it then existed, and as the divine providence had prepared it for the occasion. For that purpose human speech was a necessary vehicle, and accordingly the Greek language had been built up through the ages and prepared for the needed use. And as it was manifestly adapted to that purpose, so also it alone was available. The Hebrew was always the opposite of a world-wide dialect; it had in its best days been the language of only a single isolated people, and now for more than three hundred years it has been a *dead*

language, confined exclusively to written treatises that could be read only by professional adepts. It was also in itself unfitted for the purpose in hand, for it never gave expression to the specifically Christian conception of religious truth and doctrine. It had rendered a valuable service in recording and transmitting to after times the things which aforetime God spake to the fathers by the prophets; but as even the prophets themselves attained to only an imperfect appreciation of the great truths that they uttered, their language was not adapted to express to a remote generation trained to other modes of thought things so transcendently beyond its proper ideas. The Latin language of the age was still less fitted for such a purpose. It was essentially unspiritual—the embodied and crystallized thinking of an intensely materialistic people. Its unfitness to express other than materialistic and sensuous thoughts and ideas had been seen and felt; and it became the language of the Church only when the Church had degraded its thinking to its own low level. It was also in its widest extent a local language, and in its classical style and form it was the dialect of only a comparatively small number of specially learned orators, poets, and philosophers; for evidently the classical Latin was never the dialect of the Italian populace, and beyond Italy all forms of Latin was a foreign tongue.

The Greek language was not only in itself, by reason of its structure and its latent but effective ideality, the best suited of all the languages of the earth for the embodiment of the deep spiritual ideas of the Christian religion, but it was at that time much more nearly than any other—more so, indeed, than has ever been the case with any other living tongue—the language of the world. It had become the vehicle of the Old Testament, not only among the non-Jewish peoples on the Mediterranean Sea, but also in the Holy Land itself, for evidently it was used because best understood among the people by both our Lord and his disciples, and their quotations from the Old Testament are uniformly taken from the Septuagint; and in their ministrations, even in the interior provinces of Asia Minor, it appears that the apostles used the Greek language, and were understood by the people. This wide-spread use of one and the same language throughout the Roman Empire, and that language the one best suited to the purpose, is to be reckoned

among the particulars of the divine arrangement of affairs for the more ready diffusion of the Gospel, which constituted the age of the advent of Christ, emphatically "the fullness of the time."

But while the Greek language was clearly and incomparably better fitted than any other to become the vehicle of divine truth, it is also equally clear that as it existed in its own literature, and in men's conceptions which it sought to express, even that tongue was quite incapable of adequately indicating the deep and sublime spiritual mysteries of the Gospel. The classical Greek, with all its beauty and richness, had no words nor forms of thought that could embody the deep mysteries of the Gospel of Christ; nor had the Alexandrian and Palestinian Greek given form to the spiritual thoughts that struggled for utterance in the mind and heart of the inspired apostle. His ideas were new in kind as well as in character, and they required a new language for their embodiment, and hence we have the peculiar diction and terminology of the Epistle to the Romans.

In the nature of things language is a later growth than the mental conceptions that it is designed to express, and words are simply the means by which ideas already formed are indicated. So, in the development of the truths and doctrines of the Gospel new ideas were engendered in the minds of the prophets and psalmists, and especially in those of the apostles, for the expression of which a proper vehicle of linguistic forms was needed. But human language uniformly appears, not as a creation, new and complete, but as a growth, and by the accommodation of old words to designate new ideas. It accordingly happens, because the ideas that arise from sensuous perceptions are foremost in the order of time, that metaphysical ideas are usually expressed by words that had a sensuous and materialistic origin. And for a like cause the terms used to express the purely spiritual truths of divine revelation are derived from the things of time and sense. And unless the ideas sought to be expressed have already been formed, at least in part, in the minds addressed, there will be a lack of apprehension of the sense intended to be conveyed. Thus we find that our Lord's discourses were not understood by his unspiritual hearers because of their lack of any adequate preconceptions of the things of which he spake. And so, when St. Paul came to present in

form, and in a comprehensive unity, the deep spiritual truths and doctrines of the Gospel, using the Greek language as his vehicle, he was compelled to apply his words in a widely accommodated sense, which, however, his readers were presumed to be able to interpret in their proper spiritual sense, because they were already in possession of the elementary thoughts to which they were applied. Nor had he, in this, to begin an entirely new process, for that language had already been used to express in a popular form the partially developed truths of revelation as originally written out in the Hebrew Scriptures, and afterward translated into the Greek of the Septuagint. And the language of that version had been largely suffused by the specifically spiritual elements of the Gospel, by the use made of it by Christ and his apostles, whose teachings were known in the Church. It now fell to St. Paul, in the providential economy of the development of the doctrines of Christianity, to thoroughly digest all the elements of truth that till then lay scattered throughout the previously existing Scriptures of both the Old and the New Testament, and which also were still embodied, unwritten, in the spiritual consciousness of believers. His language, therefore, even in its specifically spiritual and doctrinal application, was not entirely new. He used the forms of speech found in the Greek of the Old Testament as they had been interpreted by Christ himself, and by his apostles after him, and whose only partially revealed spiritual import they had detected and declared, and in the clear light of the Gospel had given to its words a deeper and broader significance than had been before suspected. These scattered elements of the sublimest truth were now to be collated, and articulated, and wrought into a harmonious unity—employing the vocabulary already in use, but more precisely and definitely in respect to the ideas to be expressed. This is done in all of Paul's epistles, but nowhere else so fully and comprehensively as in the Epistle to the Romans.

In all these writings the essentially Hebrew elements may be detected in their conceptions of the divine Person and character, which are distinct and definite, so that the Godhead is completely individualized, as is not the case in any of the ethnic theologies. And this revealed Godhead appears in his proper person, *one* and *sole*, not only in fact, but also, from the necessities

of his nature, which also demonstrate his infinity, in all his perfections. The Hebrew theism was essentially unique, for it alone expressed God's revelation of himself; and that form of essential theology passed, in its fullness and with much more luminous demonstration, into the New Testament—eminently into Paul's epistles. The divinely ordained forms of worship, as observed by the fathers, and afterward reduced to specific forms in the Hebrew ritual, reappear, as to the spiritual import of their symbolism, in the fully developed and constructively arranged doctrines of sacrifice and redemption by price, and of atonement by substitution; and these are clearly wrought out by this divinely instructed apostle. And as in the Old Testament the lessons of the prophets served to expound and illustrate the symbolism of the Levitical ritual, so it became the duty of the New Testament teachers to point out the unquestionable fulfillment of these prophecies by Christ in the scheme of Gospel grace. Herein is seen a verification of the sublime truth, that "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." In this we detect the largest, best, and most purely spiritual meaning of the saying, "Christ is the end of the LAW." And to make this manifest is the object of which Paul never loses sight.

The apostle's Grecian mode of thought was especially needful for the proper elucidation of the essentially spiritual characteristics of the Gospel. The Hebrew mind appears to have been especially inclined to only objective conceptions and contemplations. It seemed to lack subjectivity and the power of introspection, and in its outlook it was inclined to take cognizance of only externals, while the religion of Christ is eminently spiritual, and the knowledge of it requires habits of subjectivity and introspection—an element in which the Greeks especially excelled. Their purely metaphysical conceptions of the *true*, the *beautiful*, and the *good* became especially available when applied to the "*truth* as it is in Jesus," to "the *beauty* of holiness," and to that essential *righteousness* which is the living spirit of the Gospel, both in Christ's atonement and in the personal salvation of believers. But in all their speculations respecting the supersensuous elements in the human character, the Greeks uniformly failed to apprehend and appreciate the highest, and the only adequate, conception of real and

essential goodness—holiness, and its spiritual opposite—SIN. To that conception the heathen mind never attained; it was a specialty of Hebrew thought, because only the Hebrew mind had been directly taught it by God himself. But this element was abundantly supplied from the Old Testament, and more clearly and forcibly by Christ's own words, and later by the writings of both St. John and St. Paul. The Hebrew conception of SIN—itself a purely metaphysical something, contemplated and defined according to the Grecian methods of thought, is the ever-present background to the apostle's wonderful presentation of the divine holiness; and his scheme of the salvation of the Gospel takes in both of these spiritual and ethical entities. The concurrence of the Hebrew substance and the Grecian methods was requisite for the proper elucidation of that which the Holy Spirit teaches when he comes, according to the promise of the departing Christ, to "convict the world [in respect] of sin, and of righteousness, and of [the] judgment."

There is also prominently manifest in this epistle a specifically Roman method of thought, in its emphatical assertion of the universal presence and the sacred sovereignty of law—its rectitude and its unchangeableness. It allowed no transgression, nor condoned any offense. Its authority was the inseparable accompaniment of the march of Roman conquest, forming an atmosphere in all Rome's dominions, and before its tribunals only the righteous could be justified, and in respect to the guilty the sword of its power was not borne in vain. How these things make their impress upon the earlier portions of the Epistle to the Romans is obvious to every thoughtful reader, intensifying the sense of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and showing that sinners shall not stand in the judgment. This rugged Roman element gives to that inspired exposition of Gospel truth its authority over men's consciences. The epistle is also specifically Roman in its subordination of the individual to the commonwealth. The human race is a great aggregate unity, in which, though the individual is not wholly lost, yet many of his highest interests are implicated in it. The head of the commonwealth of humanity is charged with the interests of the whole race, and so of every individual, who must gain or lose according as those interests in the hands that hold them are conserved or lost. Care is indeed taken to

affirm the powers and the responsibilities of the individual, but not so as to hide from our view the great truth of the *solidarity of humanity;* that in a highly important and practically effective sense the whole race of mankind was present in Adam's transgression and fall, and also in Christ's sacrifice and redemption, both effective and provisional.

The readers of this epistle will therefore do well to remember these things while seeking the deep import of what they read. Especially must a careful attention be steadily directed to the sense of the leading terms of the writings; and here neither the lexicons nor the best writing in the Greek anthology will be found to be adequate guides. When the apostle speaks of *law*, it may be according to either the Roman or the Mosaic conception, or perhaps, in a higher and broader sense, corresponding to the "Wisdom" of the eighth of Proverbs or the "Logos" of St. John; and whichever may be its sense in any given case must be clearly determined by its connections. When he speaks of SIN we are carried beyond the classical notion of *missing the mark*, of misdirected actions, to something of a purely ethical character, which looks beneath the outward forms of mechanical actions or volitional purposes into the spiritual substratum of the soul, and in its own direct relations to God himself, the essentially holy One, and the righteous Judge of all men. And placing *law* and *sin* thus apprehended over against each other, the fearful and hopeless condition of the sinner before the law becomes fearfully manifest; so disclosing the necessity for another way of salvation than simply legal righteousness. At this point is introduced the fact of atonement by Christ, the death of the *just* for the *unjust*, to bring us to God and his salvation.

Atonement by sacrifice was a well understood Hebrew idea, clearly involving the notion of vicarious suffering and its resultant benefits to the party in whose behalf the sacrifice is made: or, as Robert Hall so well and ably puts the case, "the substitution of the innocent for the guilty," in the divine appointments for man's salvation. The symbolical actions ordained in the service of the bloody sacrifices clearly imply a figurative imputation of the sins of the party for whom the offering was made to the victim, and to this fact Isaiah evidently refers when in his Messianic prophecy he declares,

"On him was laid the iniquity of us all," and "For the transgression of my people was he smitten." Paul's Hebrew methods of thought could not fail at this point to recognize a real substitution, and its appropriate results. His Roman conception of the estate of the lawful captive, and of the ransom price required for his liberation, would also serve him in this case, and by these must his words be interpreted when he declares, "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, *being made a curse* for us." And keeping in mind the ever-present realization of Christ's death for sinners, the way of salvation by faith, the "justification" that is "without the deeds of the law," stands forth self-defined in the light of the Gospel of salvation. The law contemplated a way of salvation by personal holiness of heart and life, which man could not render; this was *its justification*. The Gospel provides a substitute for this, identical in its substance and results, which the apostle calls by the same name. It is still *justification*, not by the law, but by the conditional instrumentality of *faith*, and resting ultimately on Christ's mediatorial sacrifice—a sin-offering appointed by the Father's grace. Here sin is seen in its real metaphysical nature and its intense ethical and legal badness. Here is the disposing and commutative righteousness of the divine Sovereign, appointing and accepting the atonement. Here is Christ's willing self-abnegation. Here is the ready faith of the humble and contrite sinner. This is the righteousness of the Gospel.

The epistle is in all its parts an exposition of certain great spiritual truths, and this should be steadily recognized in the interpretation of its language. It speaks of *death;* but the word is taken out of its merely temporal and physical sense, and employed to indicate a spiritual condition of separation from God and of deadness of soul to spiritual things, entailing present condemnation and tending to eternal ruin. This is the *judgment* of which the apostle says that it has come upon all men to condemnation. It speaks of *sin* as a quality and condition of the soul, under all sinful acts and thoughts of the *flesh* and the *body*, and predicated of these not in their material and physically corporeal being, but as forms of depraved and degenerate human nature, the *seat* of sin and the *instrument* of ungodliness. In St. Paul's nomenclature, the *law* is

spiritual, and the *works of the law* have their seat in the soul. *Death* is the condition of man in his fall, an alienation from God; his *condemnation* is the estimate placed on him, in his sin, by judicial holiness; his *justification* is his *acceptance with God*, in free pardon bestowed in honor of Christ's death, and in response to the sinner's own prayer of faith. The *resurrection* is the quickening of the soul with Christ, and *eternal life* is the state and condition of the renewed soul, continued into the interminable hereafter.

Art. IX.—THE LATE GENERAL CONFERENCE.

THE SITUATION, THE WORK, AND THE OUTLOOK.

The nineteenth delegated General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church was in session, in the city of Philadelphia, from the first to the twenty-eighth of May, 1884. It was composed of four hundred and sixteen delegates, from nearly a hundred Annual Conferences, of whom about three fifths were ministers and two fifths laymen. Of these, between thirty and forty were colored men, from Conferences within the old slave States; and nearly as many more were resident non-English-speaking foreigners, chiefly Germans, who have been organized into Conferences, mostly in the Western States. There were also some fifteen or sixteen delegates from foreign mission fields—Germans, Swedes, and Norwegians, with one Eurasian, and one full-blood Hindu from India, and one native African. It was said by some who had looked into the matter, that of the delegates present less than one half had been members of the General Conference of 1880, only a comparatively few of the others had been members in earlier sessions, and that nearly one half of the body was composed of new men. In age, they ranged from the thirties to the seventies, comparatively few being less than forty years old, and still fewer over seventy. One delegate (Rev. Dr. Trimble, of Ohio) had been in every General Conference since, and including that of, 1844; another had been in that of 1848, but not continuously since; and nearly a dozen had served in six, seven, or eight General Conferences. Of the laymen, three or more were serving for

the fourth time, having been in each Conference since laymen were first admitted; and a still larger number, three times. The attendance was unusually full from the beginning to the end of the session, though some seats were occupied by "Reserves," and some who began with the session were excused, giving place to alternates. This was more especially the case with the laymen; but most of even these remained steadily at their posts during the whole session.

The business of the Conference was conducted with remarkable system and regularity. During the first two days, morning and afternoon sessions were held, chiefly for organization and getting the body at its work. About a dozen "standing" committees—made up of one from each Annual Conference, so amounting to nearly a hundred members each—were ordered, each Annual Conference delegation selecting its own member; and to these committees were referred all matters relating to their various divisions of the work, to be considered and put into form for the definite and final action of the whole body, to which the findings of the committees were reported. After its complete organization, the Conference met only in the forenoon, giving up the rest of the day to the committees, and to public meetings in behalf of various societies and Church interests. The completeness of its methods of working enabled the body to get through a vast amount of work in four weeks; as much, it has been estimated, as would occupy an ordinary legislative body three times that period, and yet to do it thoroughly and systematically. These committees held from seven to fifteen sessions, averaging three hours, besides giving out a large amount of details to sub-committees, and each brought back from ten to more than twenty separate reports. Probably a full half of the work was done in these committees, which often showed an attendance of seventy or eighty members, and were conducted as regular deliberative bodies, self-organized, with chairman and secretary, and conducted by the same rules as the General Conference itself. In them were often heard quite as able discussions as any had in the more public body, and, because of their greater freedom, a class of speakers were heard in them who seldom spoke in the Conference, and whose remarks were not less valuable than those of any others. The reports so prepared were usually accepted

and confirmed by the Conference; though in several notable instances they were overruled, and largely modified or entirely reversed or rejected. It was generally declared by those whose acquaintance with former General Conferences enabled them to make the comparison, that the methods of proceeding have steadily improved, and that those of the last were better than any former one, which seems to be proved by the unprecedented fact, that every report was duly disposed of without resorting to a "grinding committee."

Respecting the *personnel* of the body, the estimate made by Bishop Simpson in his closing remarks was probably not far out of the way, when he said: "My conviction is, that there never has assembled, in the bounds of our Church, a more distinguished, a more able, and a more cultured body of delegates in the Methodist Episcopal Church." And certainly the ability and culture of the members were not more marked than were their prevailing good temper and courtesy. The debates—of ten minutes' speeches—were spirited and often able, though it was impossible within such limits to inquire into and discuss the characters and relations of the subjects in hand. But the limited time allowed made great condensation necessary, with the entire omission of both introductions and perorations. The speeches, too, taken singly, were only fragments of arguments, as only one or two points could be given by any one speaker, though two or three in succession, all on the same side, would sometimes make out a somewhat exhaustive discussion. This enforced brevity served also to prevent irrelevant and rambling talks and speeches addressed to Buncombe. It also, no doubt, served to preserve good temper and to prevent the intrusion of personalities, the absence of which was happily especially conspicuous. There was a good religious spirit pervading the body, as well as one of intense earnestness and devotion to business; and an apparent conviction that there was earnest work to be done. And yet the spirit of the body was distinctly hilarious, and both laughs and cheers were easily elicited.

Though there were so many new men in the body, yet any one familiar with former General Conferences could readily see that this was only a continuation of the series of sessions that began seventy-two years before. There were enough of

those who had had experience in earlier sessions to give shape and fashion to the proceedings; and these, without any attempt at leadership, very naturally found themselves at the head of affairs; and the others, with equal and unpurposed readiness, fell into line and went forward. It was no doubt the leaders of former sessions that were chiefly re-elected to this; and these at first were the speakers, making motions and directing in the organization, and beginning the work. But the contingent of new men soon presented a fair share of ready speakers and apt parliamentarians, and many a veteran debater found it necessary to look out for his laurels in tourneys with some of these new-comers. A full share of the debating power was shown by the laymen, some of whom had had the experience of some three, and still more of two, previous General Conferences; and even some who now appeared for the first time showed themselves the equals of the best on the floor. The body was especially independent and self-possessed—courteous, indeed, but evidently conscious of its power, and determined to discharge its duties without fear or favor.

The colored delegates constituted a notable element of the body. No one who had observed this class of delegates since their advent in 1868, when there were but two of them—and increasing each quadrennium till now there were nearly forty—could fail to be struck with the marked improvement made by them. They were really a good-looking body of men, well-dressed and well-behaved, with faces expressive of both intelligence and culture. And their conduct and manners, and especially their public performances, fully justified the promises of their appearance. They seemed to accept the position of equals among their brethren without ostentation or either cringing or undue self-assertion, and the same was accorded to them without apparent condescension.

In respect to the work taken in hand, it may be truly said that this was not a "reform" General Conference. There was an all-pervading but quiet sense of the wholesome condition of the Church, and of the generally satisfactory operation of its affairs. Whatever differences of views may have existed in the minds of delegates, no great question of Church polity seemed to be pending, nor were any wide changes of administration called for. It was very evident that the general polity

and workings of the Church were acceptable to the delegates, who also, certainly, in this fairly represented the prevailing and almost entirely undivided sentiments of both the ministry and laity of the Church. Probably the Church was never more completely at peace within itself than in this centennial year of its completed organic being. And this is the more remarkable because it had come about spontaneously, not by crushing out opposition or subduing minorities, but as the natural outgrowth of confidence and united Christian efforts for the common welfare. No word was heard in favor of doing away with or essentially modifying the Episcopacy; but, instead, it was all along assumed that this arm of the Church's power was to be preserved and cherished, and made as largely as possible effective. The Itinerancy was also steadily, though for the most part tacitly, assumed to be an essential feature of the system; and, as a rebound from certain propositions that had been made to modify that system in a way that some esteemed dangerous, the Conference declared, in the most formal and positive manner, that even to meet possible emergencies not the least change should be tolerated. In respect to Christian doctrines Methodists seldom have any difficulties; and accordingly, during all this session, not a word was heard about either fortifying the Church's standards or guarding against the encroachments of heresies. If, as has been said, the creed of Methodism is the *consensus* of its pulpits and other public teachings, these surely have found out an excellent way to preserve at once the Christian liberty and the orthodoxy of the body.

The quadrennial reports of the great financial, benevolent, and educational institutions of the Church made to the Conference formed a notable feature of the session. In every instance there had been progress; in some cases only moderate, and in others indicating remarkable successes. Relatively the increase of the Church's membership had been outstripped by the growth of nearly every other interest, and unprecedentedly large amounts had come to the various Church institutions, and especially to the schools and colleges of the Church, while very large sums had been expended in church building, and in the liquidation of debts upon houses of worship. The material progress of the Church had been simply marvelous; and the details of that progress, given in those reports, did not fail to

produce a most profound impression, and to establish the confidence of those who heard or read them in the substantial and wholesome growth of the great interests of the denomination. There can be no question that the delegates, comprising a large share of the leading ministers of the Church and representatives of the most effective class of the laity, returned to their homes more deeply than ever before impressed with the conviction of the effective progress of the Church's work, and the magnitude to which that work has grown; and the exhibits of these things as they shall go out, to the people will there beget the same hopes and confidence. Certainly this Centennial General Conference brought a good report of work done and of much more to be done.

The work actually done may be estimated either as to its outward aspects, or its less obvious but deeper and broader significance. The election of four bishops, partly to supply the wastes made by death and disease, and partly to meet increasing demands, very naturally awakened much interest. The number *four* (no more) indicated the purpose of the Conference neither to diminish nor increase the relative working force of the Episcopacy. The selection of individuals for the places was made by the free ballots of the delegates, without recognized partisan preference, and with but little respect to the claims of localities. The intimations sometimes heard about unseemly measures used to advance the successes of various candidates certainly did not appear on the surface; and while no doubt as good men were voted for and not elected as any that were chosen, even that fact is not an unmixed evil, as it left them free to serve the Church in other and, perhaps, not less important fields, and in some cases in places more difficult to fill. It is according to a well-recognized tendency in the affairs of aggregate associations of people, that with growth and advancing maturity the individual becomes less and less conspicuous. The first three or four Presidents of the United States stand out much more boldly in the nation's history than do their later successors, though some of these may have been quite their equals in all personal qualities. Greatness is commonly relative, and he who would have achieved renown in some conditions may live and die unknown. It is only natural—a sign of the real growth of the Church, and therefore not to be depre-

cated—that the Episcopacy is relatively a less force in the Church than it once was; nor is that relative position to be laid to the account of the incumbents of the office. Hereafter, probably, our Episcopacy will be somewhat more exclusively a working and administrative power than formerly; and yet, from the dignity of the position, and the power necessarily confided to the Executive during the long intervals between the General Conference sessions, the Methodist Episcopacy must continue to be a very considerable factor in the Church's affairs.

But the strength of the Methodism of the future will continue to more and more concentrate itself in the Annual Conferences. In these primary synods of the traveling ministers the available power of the Church can be best and most effectively developed and brought into action; and according as these assemblies, made up of men each acting in his own individuality, shall well or ill appreciate their positions, and feel the spirit of their calling, will it be well or ill with the Church and with its work. And that it may be all that should be desired and expected, the *esprit du corps* of the body must be cherished and recognized by all. It is those men who do the hard work, accept the poor places, live and die in comparative obscurity, and pass on to superannuation without any adequate provision against want in age and helplessness, that, after all, contribute most to the Church's greatness and practical success. It devolves on these men to carry forward all the great enterprises of the Church, not only in the "cure of souls," but also in organizing and leading on the working forces, and in raising the supplies—the money power for driving the machinery. And as there must always be leaders where men act together, so in such bodies these must be *found* rather than *appointed*, and their commissions must be in themselves—their fitness for their places being duly recognized by their associates.

Another conviction that the looker-on at the General Conference would be sure to carry away with him is, that the lay element is becoming a great power in the counsels and the work of Methodism. Such, indeed, it always has been, but that force is becoming developed and brought into working order. In the General Conference the lay element, in most individual cases, labors under the disadvantages of want of familiarity with the methods of the body, and also with the

details of the Church interests to be cared for. The former of these, however, has been pretty effectually overcome in the cases of those who have been in attendance during a number of successive sessions, and others have rapidly acquired the needed facility of action. And as to the latter, some of the laymen manifested remarkable readiness in dealing with the questions in hand, and, especially in the committees, contributed a fair share to the practical handling of the subjects to be dealt with. But the interesting point demonstrated is, that all over the land, even in the most distant parts, are found laymen who are ready to devote their time and labor and money for the sake of the Church, and who, simply as samples of a large and increasing class, are giving their studies and labors to the interests of religion.

In the proceedings of the Conference three subjects of special interest came into view: the work in the Southern States, and the race questions involved; the condition and administration of foreign missions; and the relations of the Church to the great moral issues of the times. Respecting the first of these, the Church has, all along, had a well-defined policy, to wit, that all its members shall stand upon an exact equality before its laws, and to this policy it has sought faithfully to conform its administration. But race prejudices are a social element of such far-reaching power that they cannot be altogether ignored. Accordingly, churches and conferences and schools have been organized virtually, if not in legal form, on the "color line," and to this arrangement both races have assented, while the Church, in its general administration, has accepted the fact, because those concerned desired it. But lest this form of administration might be construed as abridging the rights of some of the members of the Church in certain churches or institutions, it was broadly and emphatically declared "that this General Conference declares the policy of the Methodist Episcopal Church to be, that no member of any society within the Church shall be excluded from public worship in any and every edifice of the denomination, and no student shall be excluded from instruction in any and every school under the supervision of the Church, because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude." "Mixed" churches and schools may not be the rule in practice, but if not, the

reason is not in the law, but the local administration accepted by both parties.

The subject of the foreign missions, their administration and their relations, present and prospective, to the home Church, was among the most important and interesting of those that came before the Conference, and it was not without its perplexities. Many of those missions have grown to such proportions that it is not an easy matter to administer their affairs, simply as missions, from the central office in New York.

Most of them have been constituted Annual Conferences, and this has rendered their administration in some things the more anomalous. In all these cases the missions and churches that make up such Annual Conferences also constitute a kind of national Methodism in their several countries. The whole tendency of their normal growth is to become individualized, and that would call for, first, autonomy, and then independent self-support. But for these, neither the missions nor the Church at home appeared to be ready. To meet the demands of the case, at least in part, it was proposed to fix episcopal residences in some of the foreign fields, a measure for which a clear majority of the Conference voted, but it failed by the dissent of a majority of the lay delegates, voting by orders. But even that was confessed by its supporters to be only a temporary expedient, while complete individualization and final organic separation was generally confessed to be the goal to which they must come at length. But it was doubted whether the time for that consummation had arrived, and therefore it was thought best to leave things substantially as they have been for four years more, with the full conviction that then something more decisive must be undertaken and executed.

Respecting the great moral questions of the day, Methodism has always been outspoken and ready to give its moral support to every good cause. Three of these now came under consideration—Temperance, the Sabbath, and Divorce—and on all of these plain and earnest words were spoken, and the chief council of the Church fully indorsed and emphasized the utterances of its pulpits and the press on these vastly important subjects. On all these a great fight is impending, and it is well that the voice of the highest assembly of the Church should have spoken out in no uncertain tones.

The publishing interests of the Church were, of course, reviewed, but no considerable changes were inaugurated. Financially, those interests appear to be in a decidedly satisfactory condition, more so than at any former General Conference; the work done also shows a large aggregate of books and periodicals produced and disposed of; and yet it is apparent that the growth of this department of the Church's work is not keeping pace with the progress of the Church itself, or of some others of its interests. No doubt Methodists are using a much larger portion of both books and periodicals not of our own press than was formerly the case—a fact perhaps not to be deprecated; and yet some were not satisfied that even this might not be made otherwise, to the advantage of both publishers and buyers and readers. Especially in the department of magazine literature, now grown to vast proportions in the general trade, except in the Sunday-school department almost nothing has been done for a long time by our publishers; and in the general book business there seems to be no adequate method in use for bringing the books, when published, within the reach of the public.

The Conference closed in good order, and with a pretty full quorum, at the end of the twenty-fourth day's session, (not counting Sundays,) with its work all done—an end that was accomplished only by rushing many things to a vote with undesirable, if not unnecessary, haste, and often without any adequate discussion. But this evil was really less than it seemed, since nearly every thing had been thoroughly examined and discussed in committee, and the Conference only confirmed what had been already settled by those who had fully considered it. And so the General Conference of 1884 passed into history. It was a good session, excellent in spirit, devout, orderly, (except through excess of vivacity,) exceedingly good-tempered, zealous for the good name and prosperity of the Church, intensely denominational but not narrowly sectarian, full of faith in the agencies of the Church, and largely hopeful as to its future.

ART. X.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Reviews.

AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1884. (Philadelphia.)—1. Plurality of Worlds; by Rev. J. De Concilio. 2. Nature of the Human Soul; by Rev. J. Ming, S.J. 3. Improvement in Parochial Schools; by Rev. H. A. Brann, D.D. 4. Waning Influence of the English Universities; by A. F. Marshall, B.M., Oxon. 5. The Mormon Question and the United States Government; by Bryan J. Clinche. 6. The Propaganda Question and Our Duty; by Rev. Bernard O'Reilly, L.D. 7. Life and Times of Frederic II.; by Prof. St. George Mivart, F.R.S. 8. Prince Bismarck's Conflict with the Catholic Church; by H. J. Henser. 9. The Coming Plenary Council of Baltimore; by John Gilmary Shea, LL.D. 10. Sociological Aspects of Christian Charity; by A. de G.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, April, 1884. (Oberlin, Ohio.)—1. The Divine Personality; by James H. Fairchild, D.D. 2. The Irrepressible Conflict, (of American Slavery;) by Dr. H. von Holst, Ph.D. 3. Heredity and Depravity; by Stuart Phelps, Ph.D. 4. The Messianic Views of Christ's Contemporaries; by Rev. Prof. George H. Schodde, Ph.D. 5. The Theology of Canon Mozley; by Charles F. Thwing. 6. The Inspiration of the Old Testament; by Rev. I. P. Warren, D.D. 7. The Prophets of Israel and Place in History to the Close of the Eighth Century B. C. Eight Lectures by W. Robertson Smith, LL.D; by Rev. Israel E. Dwinell, D.D. 8. Recent Evangelistic Movements in Great Britain and on the Continent; by Samuel Ives Curtis, D.D. 9. The Niagara Gorge as a Chronometer; by Rev. G. Frederic Wright. 10. Assyrian Research, and Hebrew Lexicon; by Prof. D. G. Lyon, Ph.D. 11. Exegetical Note—Translations of the Aorist Tense in the Indicative Mood—Dr. Ladd on Alleged Discrepancies and Errors of the Bible.

CATHOLIC WORLD, (Monthly,) April, 1884. (New York.)—1. The Workman and his Little Sister; by Kathleen O'Meara. 2. Bancroft's History of the United States; by R. H. Clarke, LL.D. 3. The Wisdom and Truth of Wordsworth's Poetry, (II;) by Aubrey de Vere. 4. By-ways; by Marion A. Taggart. 5. New Mexico and her Pueblos; by the Very Rev. J. H. Dufouri. 6. Armine, (Chaps. xxxix–xlii;) by Christian Reid. 7. An Impudent Fabrication Exposed; by Rev. George Dishow. 8. The Delicacy of Shakespeare; by R. M. Johnson.

May, 1884.—1. The Catholic Law of Marriage; by Rev. A. F. Hewit. 2. Hong-Kong; by H. Y. Eastlake. 3. Katharine, (Chapters i, ii;) by E. G. Martin. 4. Evolution in the Light of Recent Researches; by Cornelius O'Leary, M.D. 5. The Wisdom and Truth of Wordsworth's Poetry, (III;) by Aubrey de Vere. 6. Histories and Catechisms; by Monsignor Preston. 7. Spring in the North; by Margaret F. Sullivan. 8. Armine, (Chaps. xliii–xlvi;) by Christian Reid. 9. The Building of the Mountain; by William Seaton.

June, 1884.—1. Darwin's Mistake; by Rt. Rev. F. S. Chatord, D.D. 2. The New Flagelants; by Inigo Deane. 3. The "Leading Article" in English Journalism; by A. F. Marshall. 4. The Very Last Centenary of Protestant Isms; by Rev. Thomas J. Jenkins. 5. The Wisdom and Truth of Wordsworth's Poetry; (IV;) by Aubrey de Vere. 6. The Isle of Thanet and Its Straits; by M. P. Thompson. 7. My Espousals. 8. In and Around the Magdalen Islands; by A. M. Pope. 9. Katharine, (Chaps. iii, iv;) by E. G. Martin. 10. Religious Liberty, as Understood by the "Evangelical Alliance;" by Rev. George M. Searles. 11. Paul. From the Polish of H. Sienkiewiezlitwes; by W. R. Thompson. 12. Honest Protestants and the Public Schools; by Rev. Walter Elliot.

CHRISTIAN REVIEW, January, 1884. (Cincinnati.) — 1. The New Testament Greek; by Pres. Chas. Louis Loos. 2. The Controversy Between Science and Religion; by Pres. W. K. Pendleton. 3. The New Testament Idea of Righteousness; by Robt. T. Matthews. 4. The Genuineness of the Pentateuch—W. Robertson Smith; by Thomas Munnell. 5. Christian Missions; by F. M. Green. 6. The Spirits in Prison, 1 Pet. iii, 19; by H. Christopher. 7. Reply to Clark Braden; by A. Wilford Hall. 8. The Revised English New Testament; by H. Turner.

April, 1884.—1. The New Testament Canon; by the Editor, (E. W. Herndon.) 2. Justification by Faith; by A. I. Hobbs. 3. The Holy Catholic Church; by C. Q. Wright. 4. Certain Infidel Objections Answered; by Clark Braden. 5. Can We Divide? by J. H. Garrison. 6. The Substantial Philosophy; by A. Wilford Hall. 7. The Doctrine of the Epistle to the Romans, (Chap. i, 16;) by I. B. Grubbs.

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, April, 1884. (New York.)—1. Rev. Dr. James Richards and his Theology; by Prof. Ransom B. Welch, D.D. 2. The Ontological Argument for the Divine Existence; by Prof. William T. Shedd, LL.D. 3. The Unity of the Apocalypse with Reference to Dr. Volter's Strictures; by Prof. Benj. B. Warfield, D.D. 4. The Consensus of the Reformed Confessions; by Prof. A. A. Hodge, D.D. 5. Dr. Stanton on Healing Through Faith; by Rev. Marvin R. Vincent, D.D.

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH, April, 1884. (Nashville, Tenn.)—1. The Witness of the Spirit; by Bishop H. N. M'Tyeire, D.D. 2. Method and Aim of Mathematical Physics; by W. B. Smith, Ph.D. 3. Women of Shakespeare; by Mrs. Lucia Porter Lander. 4. Unconscious Orthodoxy; by Rev. W. Harrison. 5. Early Christianity—How Propagated; by J. Thomas Pate. 6. Quixotism in Philosophy; by Rev. W. C. Black. 7. Rationale of Christian Atonement; by Rev. R. Abbey, D.D. 8. Manliness of the Pulpit; by Rev. F. M. Edwards. 9. Future Mission of Methodism; by Rev. J. B. Robbins. 10. Janet's Theory of Morals; by the Editor.

UNITARIAN REVIEW, AND RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE. June, 1884. (Boston.)—1. The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; by Rev. W. R. Alger. 2. A Few More Words about Dr. Dewey; by Rev. Edward F. Hayward. 3. The Authority of our Faith; by Rev. Charles F. Dole. 4. Translations of Virgil; by M. Grant Daniel. 5. Twenty Years in the Life of a Queen; by Rev. Robert Collyer. 6. Mr. Cooke's George Eliot; by Rev. J. T. Sunderland.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, May, June, 1884. (Cincinnati.) 1. The Curse upon Nature; by Franklin Johnson, D.D. 2. Limitations of Taxation; by J. L. M. Curry, LL.D. 3. Emotional Excitement in Preaching; by H. F. Kerfoot, D.D. 4. Natural Law in the Spiritual World; by Wayland Hoyt, D.D. 5. The Moral Element in Providence; by Henry M. King, D.D. 6. Baptists and Liberty of Conscience—The English Baptists, 1644–1689. 7. Biblical Theology: Its Nature, Presuppositions, Methods, and Perils; by Prof. Albert H. Newman, LL.D.

The first article above named discusses a subject that is just now in a somewhat unsettled condition in the public mind. Men are doubting, and beginning to ask whether or not there is cause to believe that the "fall" was the direct occasion of any changes in the physical world. The affirmative side of this question has been the common doctrine of Protestantism from the beginning, and learned theological and biblical writers have given to it the authority of their names, and the aid of their learning and genius, and till comparatively

lately it would have been accounted almost a heresy to call it in question. But men who think independently are beginning to ask whether any, and if any, what, are the changes that came upon the material earth on account of Adam's transgression.

The old divines and commentators, who thought and wrote without the inconvenience of scientific facts to interfere with their theories, assumed that all sorrow and suffering in the animal world, and especially all deaths, were the fruits of Adam's sin. It is quite certain that Milton, who was simply the interpreter of the thought of his times, so presents the case in the opening lines of "Paradise Lost," assuming that by the "death" which was brought into the world by "the mortal taste" of the "forbidden tree" that of all and every species of animals is intended. It was also held that the convulsions of nature, earthquakes and volcanoes, floods and tempests, animal ferocity, the poison of serpents, and the stings of bees, thorns and thistles, toil and hunger, are facts in the world of which man's transgression was the procuring cause. But the demonstrations of natural science, and a better interpretation of Scripture, together with the more rational methods of thinking that distinguish our times, have largely interfered with these traditional beliefs. Men are now asking, What about these things? and, like the "more noble" Bereans, are searching the Scriptures to ascertain for themselves what they teach on this subject.

The above article is a result of this newly awakened spirit of inquiry, and it is evidently the utterance of a mind only halfway emancipated from the toils of traditional presuppositions. The writer sets out with the concession that physical suffering and death antedated man's transgression, and that almost absolutely certainly they were made sure to occur by the original creation of carnivorous animals, which certainly in the older geological era, untold ages before man, could live only by causing the death of other animals. The increase of animals by births also supposes the deaths of the older ones—by violence, or disease, or old age—and the history of this process of dying is written in clearly legible characters on the earth's tables of stone. To harmonize these things with the notion that all animal suffering must be the result of man's sin, we have the fanciful theory of anticipatory penalty—the infliction of the curse before the commission of the offense, and, indeed,

long ages before the offender was created—a theory favored by Dr. Bushnell, though perhaps not original with him, but whose genius imparted to it a glamour which seemed to hide its baselessness and absurdity. Any rational consideration of the subject must lead to the sure conviction that so much and such kind of suffering as pertains to the life and death of irrational animals existed long before the sin of Adam, and as certainly it is not in any possible way caused by it. And the old notion, that the convulsions of nature and all kinds of cosmical and meteorological disorders are in any way the result of Adam's transgression, (see Wesley's sermon on "The Restitution of all Things," and Fletcher's "Appeal,") must be dismissed as purely fanciful—the late lingering traces of the unreasoning superstition of the Dark Ages.

Two portions of Scripture are relied on as the sole authority in this case—Genesis iii, 17–19, the divine curse pronounced upon Adam; and Romans viii, 19–23, the humiliation and hope of "the creature." Respecting the former of these, the writer of the Review article concludes, (so far wisely,) that all the changes that occurred by which the curse was realized were not in the earth and nature, but in man himself, whose changed conditions, which his sin effected, so changed his relation to his environments that what had been a blessing became a curse. But when the writer comes to interpret the statement in Romans he is decidedly less successful. Here, no doubt, every thing depends on the sense of the word rendered "the creature," (κτίσις.) Of the many meanings given to that word, as used by St. Paul, by commentators and theologians, only two need be noticed: (1) that which refers it to the whole human race, aggregate MAN, and (2) that which makes it mean *Nature*, inert matter and irrational animal creation. Of these two the above writer accepts the latter, while we should, without any misgivings, take the former. So understood, St. Paul teaches that humanity (man) is waiting in "earnest expectation" for the divine manifestation which shall reveal its sonship with God, and that the divine will, in the mysterious dispensation of his goodness, subjected *man* to "vanity"—vicissitudes—through which his instinctive aspirations for immortality shall be realized; that for the time being universal humanity is travailing in the birth-throes by which it is to rise into a

higher life, and that even Christians, though born of the Spirit, are still in this transition, "waiting for the adoption." This is substantially the view taken by a large share of the very best commentators, both ancient and modern. Of the latter may be named, among others, Stuart and Hengstenberg. This interpretation, of course, entirely excludes any reference to the outer world, and saves the word "creature" from its unelevated application to merely brute-beasts—cattle.

In this subject is also involved the question of the nature of the penalty of sin threatened before the transgression, and realized through it—that is, *death*. Should it be understood as physical or spiritual? The former, no doubt, has been the faith of the Church, at least as it has been commonly received through nearly its entire history. But will it bear the clear light of the rational interpretation of Scripture? That spiritual death passed upon man in the day he sinned will not be doubted, and that from the death superinduced by sin, as stated by St. Paul, spiritual death must not be excluded, will also be granted; and if shut up to this alone, a well-rounded fullness of meaning is given to all that is predicated in the Scriptures referred to. Death was set forth as sure to occur upon the occurrence of the first transgression, and spiritual death certainly took place. The apostle declares that by that first offense sin entered into the world, bringing also death, which is certainly true as to spiritual death. Did that curse also include the death of the body?

This leads to the further inquiry, whether or not that transition of "the creature" (commonly called "death") by which the spiritual being—which is the only proper personality—becomes detached from its physical investiture, is a consequence of the "fall." In the article referred to there is a supposition that not improbably such a change was contemplated in man's original constitution, and that without sin man might have outgrown his earthly vestments, and by a painless process passed into a higher state; and this is substantially a granting that physical death was the original destination of Adam and all his posterity, and that not natural death itself, but its painful accidents, occur as the results of sin.

Bishop Foster's statement will not be called in question, that "all physical life is in its nature perishable, and wherever found

to exist, and as soon as it exists, and as an inseparable concomitant of its existence, it tends to extinction, and must inevitably, by the operation of its law, reach extinction. Nothing short of eternal miracle, set for the guardianship of each life, would guarantee its deathless continuance. When it shall succumb to the wastes and assaults of other unfriendly forces is only a question of limited time."

This is not a novel position, and to meet the demands of the case the necessary "eternal miracle" is supposed to be provided for in the "tree of life." It is assumed that the use of that tree was sacramental, of course effective *ex opere operato*, to overcome the natural flux of the body, or to repair its waste, not necessarily to render it intrinsically immortal, but by perpetually counteracting the natural tendencies to decay to effectually hinder dissolution.

But as has been said elsewhere, "this whole affair of the 'tree of life' has the appearance of an attempt at wisdom quite beyond the range of what is written. It is artificial and extra-scriptural, and seems to have been entertained only because it helps to solve, conjecturally, a difficult problem—made so by an unsupported theory—by putting an altogether unwarranted meaning into a doubtful passage of Scripture."

The subject calls for a fuller inquiry and a more elaborate discussion than it can here receive, and quite certainly it will receive such handling from some one, or many, in the near future. The questions involved are not between orthodoxy and heresy, but they are simply about the meaning of the words and phrases of Holy Scripture, and the trend of thought among evangelical Christians respecting the great problems of providence and grace—of God's eternal purposes in the redemption and glorification of "the creature"—man.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, April, 1884. (New York.)—1. Decline of American Shipping: by N. Dingley, Jr., M.C., and John Codman. 2. Shall our Civilization be Preserved? by Judge J. A. Jameson. 3. The Development of Religious Freedom; by Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff. 4. Changes of the Climate of North America; by Dr. Felix L. Oswald. 5. A Plea for Modern Languages; by Prof. C. A. Eggert. 6. Literature for Children; by Julian Hawthorne. 7. Recent Criticisms of the Bible; by the Rev. A. G. Mortimer and the Rev. Dr. R. H. Newton.

May, 1884.—1. Defective Naturalization Laws; by Justice William Strong. 2. Matthew Arnold; by Edwin P. Whipple. 3. A Zone of Worlds; by Richard A. Proctor. 4. The Railway and the State; by Gerrit L. Lansing. 5. Illustrations of Memory; by Prof. H. F. Osborn. 6. The Meaning of Song; by

Helen Kendrick Johnson. 7. Working-Men's Grievances; by William Godwin Moody and Prof. J. L. Loughlin.

June.—1. Harboring Conspiracy; by Prof. Henry Wade Rogers. 2. Lords of Industry; by Henry D. Lord. 3. The Struggle for Immortality; by Elizabeth Stuart Phelps. 4. Sociological Fallacies; by Prof. W. G. Sumner. 5. Rise and Fall of Authority; by President J. C. Welling. 6. Walt Whitman; by Walker Kennedy. 7. Expert Testimony; by Rossiter Johnson, and others.

July.—1. Juries and Jurymen; by Judge Robert C. Pitman. 2. American Economics; by Prof. Van Beuren Denslow. 3. Marriage and Divorce; by Justice Noah Davis. 4. The Annexation of Canada; by Dr. P. Bender. 5. Government Telegraphy; by Prof. D. M'G. Means. 6. Private Vengeance; by Charles T. Congdon. 7. The Future of the Negro; by Prof. C. A. Gardiner, and others.

In the last of the above articles we have what has, in other cases, been denominated a "symposium;" ten different writers, of widely different sentiments and modes of seeing the subject, discuss the negro problem, each from his own standpoint. Professor Charles A. Gardiner first gives some of the chief elements of the problem, the numerical increase of the race, their intellectual and moral improvement, and the certainty of their continuance, with wise and hopeful suggestions respecting their future. Senator John T. Morgan follows with a fire-eater's tirade against the negro and all who care for him, except as a beast of burden, with a general assumption that he is rapidly going to the bad. Frederick Douglass glances at the subject, recognizing its dangers, but still hoping, though apparently against hope. Senator Vance, of North Carolina, writes in a much better spirit than his colleague from Alabama, refers in uncomplimentary terms to his political associations, but indulges in no prophecies. Joel Chandler Harris writes learnedly, perhaps wisely, and suggests considerations that all parties may well consider. Professor R. T. Greener treats the subject from the stand-point of an educated colored man; confirms its difficulties and suggests things needed, and is on the whole hopeful. Oliver Johnson is characteristically positive and hopeful, because he assumes that the negro will vindicate his claims to respect, which in due time will be freely awarded. General Armstrong, of the Hampton School, writes discreetly, hopefully, yet not wholly with assurance. J. H. Walworth and J. A. Emerson, speaking for their race, express strong confidence in their future.

All who allude to the subject agree that there is no reason that the colored population of the country is at all likely to become relatively less than it now is, and not unlikely large parts

of the old slave States will become very largely Africanized. All agree that the less they have to do with politics the better for themselves and their race. Respecting the natural results of miscegenation, which all deprecate, there is wide disagreement. Our own view is not in accordance with that usually so confidently assumed, that the intermingling of races tends to physical, mental, or moral deterioration. It is quite plain that the wisest men find themselves entirely at a loss as to what is to come out of the whole thing. But *the Lord reigns.*

We are not, however, compelled to wait, building our hopes entirely upon our faith in what the Lord will bring about in some unthought-of way. That transition from slavery to freedom has been made, and its immediate results belong to history, and these have largely justified the hopes of those who sought for the destruction of slavery. That the physical condition of the negroes in freedom is not worse than it was in slavery is proved by the rapid increase of the ratio of births over deaths; and that their labor has not become less valuable is shown by the statistics of production in the South. Both of these facts make it probable that there has not been any marked moral deterioration, and other patent facts and statistics confirm this view. That, on the whole, the intellectual status of the race is higher after twenty years of freedom than at any previous time is perhaps universally conceded, and certainly it cannot be denied. No doubt the Africo-American is very far from being an absolutely perfect being; it may even be granted that his intellectual and moral status is a low one, and yet it need not be concluded that he is worse than others in like conditions, and that some decided advancement has been made toward improvement.

JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY, April, 1884. (New York.) — 1. Reason and Revelation; by A. J. F. Behrens, D.D. 2. The Resurrection of Christ an Historical Fact; by Prof. Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D. 3. Prayer and Miracle in Regard to Natural Law; by Rev. L. W. Bacon. 4. ΔΙΔΕΚΑ ΤΩΝ ΔΩΔΕΚΑ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ, ΝΥΝ ΠΡΟΤΟΝ ΕΚΔΙΔΟΜΕΝΗ ΥΠΟ ΦΙΛΟΘΕΟΥ ΒΡΥΕΝΝΙΟΥ, ΜΗΤΡΟΠΟΛΙΤΟΥ ΝΙΚΟΜΗΔΕΙΣ. 5. Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, (Translation;) by Prof. S. Stanhope Orris, Ph.D. 6. The Genuineness, Priority, Source, and Value of "The Teaching;" by J. Rendel Harris, M.A. 7. The Phraseology of "The Teaching," as an Index of its Age; by Isaac H. Hall, LL.B. 8. Comments on "The Teaching;" by Elijah R. Craven, D.D. 9. Sources of Christian Archæology: by A. L. Frothingham, Jr.

It will be seen that a large share—Articles IV to VIII, inclusive—is devoted to the newly discovered Greek MS. called

"The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." Articles IV and V, the former the Greek text and the latter a translation, occupy opposite pages, so presenting at a glance the original and its equivalent in English. The next three articles, VI, VII, VIII, each by a different author, discuss the document in relation to the several points by which its character and value must be determined. That their work is well and ably done the reputations of the writers is a guarantee, and "The Teaching," under their inquest, is shown to be an exceedingly valuable "find," almost certainly genuine, in tone and substance very nearly akin to the apostolical writings, a catholic epistle in its character, and quite in harmony with the undoubtedly canonical epistles. It is the most valuable discovery of its class since that of the Codex Sinaiticus by Tischendorf, and its discovery suggests the thought that further researches through the libraries of the Orient may lead to other equally valuable revelations. Two results may be anticipated as pretty sure to come out of such further unearthing of ancient authorities: (1) that the notion of the exceptional purity of the average Christians of the early Church will scarcely be maintained; and (2) the claim that a certain arrangement of ministerial orders is of apostolic origin, and was fully recognized as of divine appointment in the earliest ages of the Church, will not be confirmed by their "teaching."

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, April, 1884. (London.)—1. Perfect Sanctification; by Rev. Prof. Croskery, (Magee College, Londonderry.) 2. Theories of the Atonement, "Moral Influence," and "Satisfaction;" by Rev. R. G. Balfour, (Edinburgh.) 3. Studies in Scottish Ecclesiastical Biography: Professor Simson, the Glasgow Heresiarch; by Rev. C. G. M'Crie, (Ayr.) 4. The Lake of Geneva, and its Literary Associations; by Rev. Hugh Macmillan, D.D., LL.D., (Greenock.) 5. Professor Max Müller on the Origin and Growth of Religion; by Prof. S. H. Kellogg, D.D., (Alleghany, Pa.) 6. Theories of Inspiration; by Alvah Hovey, D.D., (Newton, Mass.) 7. Some Race Problems in China; by J. A. P.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April, 1884. (London.)—1. Mechanical Philosophy. 2. Frederick Denison Maurice. 3. Father Curci and the Vatican. 4. The House of Lords since 1832. 5. Dictionary Making, Past and Present. 6. Re-Housing the Industrial Classes. 7. Non-Conformity and the Universities—Free Churches and a Theological Faculty.

EDINBURGH REVIEW OR CRITICAL JOURNAL, April, 1884. (Leonard Scott Publishing Company, Philadelphia.) — 1. Memoirs of Lord Lyndhurst. 2. Stephens's History of the Criminal Law. 3. The Chronicle of James I. of Aragon. 4. Green's Conquest of England. 5. The Scottish Universities. 6. Heth and Moab. 7. The Unity of Nature; by the Duke of Argyll. 8. Sayce's Herodotus. 9. The Coming Reform—Egypt.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, (Wesleyan,) April, 1884. (London.)—1. Through Materialism to Idealism; by Frederic Albert Lange. 2. The Monastic Knights. 3. Drummond's Natural Law in the Spiritual World. 4. Renan's Recollections of his Youth. (Translated from the French.) 5. Bishop Martensen. 6. East Anglia. 7. The Salutation of the Riseng Son. 8. Egypt.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April, 1884. (Leonard Scott Publishing Co., Philadelphia.)—1. The Samson-Saga, and the Myth of Herakles. 2. The Censorship of the Stage. 3. Lord Lyndhurst. 4. Representation and Misrepresentation. 5. The Queen's Latest Book. 6. Co-operation or Spoliation. 7. Codification of English Law: a Retrospect and a Prospect. Independent Section: Compulsory Vaccination. Contemporary Literature: (1) Theology. (2) Philosophy. (3) Politics, Sociology, Voyages and Travels. (4) Science. (5) History and Biography. (6) Belles-Lettres. India and Our Colonial Empire.

German Reviews.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN, (Theological Essays and Reviews.) 1884. Third Number.—*Essays:* 1. USTERI, Calvin's Doctrine of the Sacrament and Baptism. 2. USTERI, The Position of the Strasburg Reformers, Bucer and Capito, to the Question of Baptism. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. SCHULTZ, A Modern Apologetic Question in the Ancient Garb. 2. FRANKE, 2 Cor. vi, 14–vii, 1, and the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. v, 9–13. 3. KOLDEWEY, The First Effort for a Justification of the Bigamy of the Landgrave Philip of Hesse. 4. BUCHWALD, The Conflict of Luther with the Wittenberg Chapter, 1523–24. *Reviews:* 1. CREMER, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament Greek; Reviewed by Grimm. 2. KOLDE, Analecta Lutherana; Reviewed by Knaake. 3. KOLDE and KOLDEWEY, Publications of the Society for the History of the Reformation, Nos. 1 and 2; Reviewed by Kawerau. 4. A Circular Letter of the Supreme Protestant Consistory of Berlin, Concerning the Revision of the Luther Bible.

The entire body of this number of the Review is absorbed by two articles by Usteri, a Protestant pastor of Switzerland in the Canton of Zürich. That so much space is given to the one subject of the baptismal teachings of the early reformers is a striking proof of the deep hold that the ceremony of baptism has taken on the German heart. This ordinance of the Church may be said to have been at one time almost universal with the German nature, whether Christian or unchristian. And one who has lived for a time among them, and had an opportunity to see the inside of their social life, will find that parents who will reject every other Christian practice and ceremony still cling to this first one of the early Christians. Especially among

the poorer classes the fear is so great that the new-born child may die without the performance of the ceremony, that an unseemly haste is often exhibited in hurrying the tender infant to the baptismal font, that its claim on future salvation may not be forfeited by any dilatory action on the part of the parents. And there are cases on record where, in instances of difficult and dangerous parturition, involving a risk to the life of the yet new-born child, a species of ante-natal baptism has been performed.

And the popular heart has clung no more closely to this religious ceremony than have the various teachers of the Church at and since the period of the Reformation. Usteri finds it, therefore, fitting and advisable to give two articles on this subject. The first is devoted to the doctrine of Calvin concerning baptism, and the second to the position of the Strasburg Reformers and Zwingli. We can, of course, but simply touch the main points discussed in each case. One of the deepest thoughts of Calvin is that baptism is the sacrament of incorporation into Christ, with a share in all his wealth of grace. And this feature is not entirely wanting to Zwingli, but is brought out on the occasion of the baptism of Jesus by John. In the earlier and later writings of Zwingli, parallels for the most part of the doctrines of Calvin may be found, in so far as they illustrate the value of the sacrament as a symbolical representation, and not of a grace-imparting character in the narrower sense. Zwingli's dualism was opposed to the acknowledgment of the latter. Calvin clung closely to the double idea of baptism, which he called the "*Mortificatio* and the *Ablutio*." He claimed that baptism is a *symbolum veritatis*, namely, a symbol of truth that Christ shed his blood for us. With Zwingli, baptism is more a reference to Christ with a moral aim. With Calvin, on the contrary, it is a testimony and accompanying seal of the entrance into Christ, through grace and faith, and the participation in all his gifts. According to Zwingli it is a symbolical guide from the outer court of the senses into the inner sanctuary of a life of grace. Calvin abolishes this dualism, and makes the sacrament belong to the sanctuary of the revelation of God, which, so to say, has its spirit and its body, its internal and its external side. It is nothing else than the external, but, therefore, not less divine, manifestation of

that which grace will internally effect for the practice and the strengthening of the faith.

The correspondence between the Strasburg theologians and Zwingli touches the baptismal question as early as 1524. In a publication of this date Bucer declares it to be a great error to ascribe such effect to water baptism as to assert that unbaptized children are lost. He declares that a difference must be made between baptism with water and baptism with the Spirit: the former is simply the baptism of man, and is a mere symbol, while the latter is the baptism of Christ. In this sense the baptism of John and that of the apostles was alike; and here Bucer refers to Acts, 2d and 19th chapters, as to the character of the two baptisms. As to the water baptism, Bucer declares that it is performed in the name of Christ, or with the formula of the Trinity. Even the apostles, he says, distinguish sharply between the two kinds of baptism; Peter, for example, speaking of the saving power of baptism, declares that it is not alone an ablution from the filth of the flesh; while Paul points to it as an act of faith, and Titus as a renewal of the Holy Ghost. The entire tendency of the two lengthy articles is in sympathy with the modern inclination of German theologians, namely, that baptism by man is an external and very advisable ceremony, but not an indispensable one to the salvation of the soul.

The circular letter of the Supreme Consistory of Berlin regarding the revision of the Luther Bible shows us how carefully and thoroughly they perform matters of this kind in Germany. The revision of the Old Testament was begun in 1871, by a commission of seventeen members, to perform this great and important work in eighteen conferences, each having from eight to ten sessions. A commission consisting of ten members for the revision of the New Testament was formed in 1865, and finished its work in 1870. A complete revision of the Old Testament was published by a Bible House in Halle, to which was added the revision of the New Testament, and the entire revision has been published under the title of the "Proof-Bible." It was a unanimous wish of all concerned in the revision and the printing of this new Bible that it should have the advantage of the judgment and the emendation of biblical scholars of all shades and specialties. It is

hoped that the judgments thus obtained may be of great interest and value; and therefore the Supreme Consistory at Berlin sends out this circular letter to all biblical scholars, praying that they may, at as early date as possible, send in the alterations and emendations that they suggest, that these may be considered and read for a third time by the Commission. This final revision will then be performed by sections, and finally in a full conference, so that every possible means will be adopted and all scholarly investigation be called into activity, with a view to make this revised Luther Bible as perfect as possible. The Supreme Consistory hopes by this mode to obtain the Word of God in a translation so perfect that it will form a mighty bond for the unity of German Protestant Christendom.

French Reviews.

REVUE CHRETIENNE, (Christian Review,) February, 1884.—1. PRESSENSÉ, Response to Prof. Bouvier. 2. VIGUIÉ, Zwingli. 3. ROEHRICH, On the Way. 4. NYEGAARD, English Chronicle. 5. VINARD, The Path. 6. RICHEMOND, Bibliographical Notices. Reviews of the month by PRESSENSÉ.

March, 1884.—1. HOLLARD, The Sabbath. 2. BOEGNER, A New History of Coligny. 3. ST. ANDRÉ, The Conquest of Africa. Monthly Review by PRESSENSÉ.

April, 1884.—1. HOLLARD, The Sabbath. 2. ASTIÉ, The Fear of the Protestant Principle in the Ranks of French Protestantism. 3. ALONE, Switzerland and its Poets. 4. MÉNÉGOZ, The Baptism of Children in Accordance with the Principles of Pauline Theology. 5. L. R., Biographical Notices. Review of the month by E. DE PRESSENSÉ.

Since M. de Pressensé has become a member of a French Senate, the cream of the *Revue* will often be found in his monthly review of French political and social questions, in which he is not always in harmony with his religious and political friends. He is quite inclined to live up even to a bad law until it can be carefully and legally modified, and thus, for instance, he is now virtually supporting the Concordat because of the *quasi* protection that some of its provisions afford to French Protestants as well as to French Catholics. In the February number he touches with much spirit on the social problem in the reception that it lately met in the Chamber of Deputies. A Commission of Inquiry had been formed, with orders to report on the matter, with a view to some general discussion

before the Chambers, and Pressensé found it amusing as well as embarrassing to notice the different remedies proposed according to the different shade of politics of the Reporter.

To commence with the infinitely little, the Protectionists' Party declared that the problem would be solved and every thing settled if heavy duties were imposed: a good Custom-house on the frontier would suffice to settle the matter. The Royalists' Party, represented by one of its champions, had simply this advice to give: "Take my king, and all will be saved." That portion of the Right which is still more Catholic than Royalist, especially since the death of the Count de Chambord, says: "Re-establish the power of the Holy Church, restore the old working corporations placed under its influence, and you will see again to flourish the golden age of the ancient monarchy." To which M. Frédéric Passy, one of the most distinguished of French economists, replied, by reminding the members of the character of this golden age, with the exception of a few privileged ones, namely, that the mass of the nation was deadened by poverty and ignorance while supporting the weight of the social edifice and paying with the sweat of its brow the gold that the king lavished on his favorites. M. Passy showed the unfavored condition of the working classes of our day in education and well-being. The President of the Council, in a labored discourse, presented a programme of the reforms immediately possible, and pointed out what part the government can take for the relief of the present suffering by the execution of great public works, which he strongly recommended.

M. Clémenceau, the Radical leader, touched all the social problems without casting much light on any of them, and leaving without immediate remedy a sum of sufferings and inequalities which are so much the more keenly felt because the progress of instruction has been more rapid. It is true, this progress increases the means of acquiring ease; but when this latter does not come with it, the privations are thereby made more painful. The civil equality now possessed by all sharpens the aspirations for social equality. The Republican Deputies who took part in this grave discussion insisted with reason, some on the necessity of hastening the reform of the imposts, still very unequally divided, and others on the development of the

principle of co-operation. The State Socialism, which would confine the social reform to the central power, and impose on it a system of colossal alms, did not find many representatives in the present Chamber. It therefore resulted from this peculiar debate, that the official world of France is very far from being as much imbued with the spirit of socialism as were the Republican assemblies of 1848. The chasm in this regard is very great between the present assembly and the working class, which it does not truly represent. This chasm can only be filled by a moral force which the politics of the day does not give, and by a genuine love for the weak and the suffering, combined with a spirit of justice and of liberty.

Pressensé seems to think that the only power that can solve the problem is, that love and pity for the multitude that was shown in olden time by the great Master when he fed the hungry, healed the sick, and encouraged the downcast. In this way, he believes, may come from the Church an inspiration which shall lead to the solution of the social question. But even what he has to say, although excellent as far as it goes, has a certain vague and unsatisfactory character that leaves the question about where it was found. Thus the many heads of France seem still incapable of doing more than presenting individual and conflicting opinions, with but little hope of arriving at harmony.

It is very certain that the Protestant Churches of France have nothing to expect or hope from the present dominant party, which seems quite ready to restrict its liberties and withhold its subsidies. It is to be hoped that in this crisis the Protestants will comprehend their present duty, and follow the wise counsels given to them by one of the most faithful friends of the Reformed Church in the conclusion of an admirable lecture which we find in the monthly review of the April number on "Christian Activity in the Bosom of French Protestantism." It is by M. Castelnau, on the separation of Church and State, and is so good and pointed that we must give it in his own words:

Some years ago this question would have been for us a fearful crisis; but to-day, if it is done without injustice, we shall find ourselves on the morrow what we were on the eve of the event, and we shall gladly pay for our independence. The material

condition of this independence is, in fact, a Synodal Treasury, the common fund of our churches, and the visible sign of their solidarity; our budget of worship destined to supplement the growing defections of the budget of the State, and take its place at the hour of separation. When our flock shall understand the influential role of the Synodal Treasury the Church will be the mistress of its own destiny.

Let us not be deceived in this matter; the separation is commencing now by the finances, and it will not stop there. Let us learn to do our business for ourselves, if we do not wish it to be done without us and against us. After all, to take charge of one's own affairs, and to depend in matters of religion only on God and one's own conscience and devotion, is the very essence of Protestantism, and was and is to be yet its glory. Let us not imagine that because the national flag still floats over our churches we may go to sleep in a deceitful security. No! above all, no illusion! Illusion, for many churches, would be death. And at the same time, let there be no fears and no discouragements; do not listen to those who say to you that if the State were to withhold its purse our churches would be lost. What! can we French Protestants not do what is done by the English, the Scotch, the Swiss, the Americans, and even the Irish Catholics? Can we not do what our brothers of the *Eglises Libres* are doing at our very doors? Can we not pay—we whose fathers could die? By what right, I pray you, is this insult cast into the face of our churches? As for me, who have hastily passed over their works, very far from speaking to you of discouragement, I wish more than ever to speak to you of hope. We are entering upon a crisis, but it depends on us only to make this crisis our salvation. Let us learn to look it manfully in the face! Let us make our Protestant people touch this peril with the finger, and let us all work with one heart under the eye of God for the progress of the Gospel and the elevation of our churches through their synods. In this, gentlemen, there is a strength which we do not yet seem to suspect. We are at the beginning of this conflict, and the impulse is yet scarcely given; let us wait and fortify our hearts.

If at the commencement of the century, when our Church counted scarcely 130 pastors and not a church in activity, not any one whatever, then when there reigned around it only silence and oblivion, a voice had arisen to announce that in 70 years French Protestantism would have 1,200 pastors, would perform the works that we have seen, would give for its faith and for those who suffer many millions per year, and would reestablish the synodal *régime* for which our fathers had so long sighed in vain—I ask you, who would have believed it? Who would not have charged this strange prophecy with mad enthusiasm? But nevertheless this prophecy has been realized, God be praised! and thus will be realized the hope to which I, to-day, invite you.

Brothers, let us then rejoice and return thanks! Let us think of what we were and of what we now are. No discouragement, no faint-heartedness. Let our hearts beat high, high above all fear and distrust, very high above all littleness and unwholesome zeal for the spirit of sect or party. Let us work with those who work, let us love with those who love, let us pray with those who pray, let us hope with those who hope. The future belongs to the eternal God.

ART. XI.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANT WORK IN SPAIN.

A LEADING German Protestant of Stuttgart recently made a visit to Spain, with a view of there studying the present evangelizing work in its various phases, and in an extended report gave a very interesting account of the activity of foreign Protestant workers on Spanish soil. In the north-eastern section of the land an American mission, led by Mr. Thomas Gulick, of Boston, supports eleven churches. In nine cities there are regular pastors or evangelists; while two cities, though without their own pastors, have regular meetings. The expense of supporting these amounts to about $20,000 yearly, which passes through the hands of a brother of the above, now stationed in San Sebastian. In his report of the work he declared that fifteen or twenty years ago he would not have thought of urging the Spaniards to support the mission from their own means, but that now he endeavors to take collections from the congregations, though the members are nearly all of the poorer classes. In Valladolid a worthy English gentleman by the name of Armstrong commenced the work of evangelization in 1870 by forming a congregation. This work has already extended to nine centers, which together count 120 Church members and about 80 children in a school taught by a Spanish teacher. In Seville, where the Inquisition once had its principal seat, we find the only churches for Protestants in Spain; the other buildings are merely chapels or prayer-rooms. The pastor of the principal one of these churches is supported by a Scotch Committee, and the congregation numbers about 140 members. The minister of a second congregation is maintained by the Anglican Church, and still a third church is in possession of the Protestants, as is a chapel in the suburbs. Four hundred children are reported to be in the Protestant schools of Seville.

In Cadiz and Xeres there are small Protestant congregations, ranging from 9 to 45 members, with 150 school children in all. The pastors of these are supported by the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland. This body also sustains a school of 150 children in Puerto. This is a sea-port and a very important city, to which has been transferred the English Seminary for the training of teachers and preachers.

In Malaga there are 130 enrolled members, with 100 communicants and about 200 school children, all supported by the Anglican Church. There are three principal Protestant congregations in Barcelona, of which the most effective one is controlled by a Swiss Committee of Lausanne, and whose preacher is said to speak Spanish better than any other of the foreign clergy. Auberlen gives it as his decided opinion that the Protestant work would be very weak were it not for the foreign teachers. The Spaniards have not in themselves the strength and enterprise to carry on the work without direction and aid. He thinks that of the many school children a very small proportion will be likely to grow up into genuine Protestant Church members. On the whole, his judgment is not very encouraging in regard to the children.

THE WORSHIP OF THE SAINTS IN ITALY.

When the United Kingdom of Italy was formed, and Rome became its capital, the government and local authorities in a great many sections adopted various measures with a view to confine the celebration of the saints within the churches, and to put an end to all noisy and pomp ous celebrations in public. The first step to be taken in this direction was to prevent all state officials from taking any official part in the ceremony, and for a time there was comparatively little outward show in Italy of the saint-worship of the churches. But for the last few years the ceremonies are again gaining ground in public, while the rescripts and regulations are being forgotten. Of late many of the patron saints have their former noisy festivals, which crowd out all regular religious service, and at which many of the civil authorities again appear. We quote a few examples as illustrations. In Modena two pretended martyrs are worshiped as patron saints. In the financial report of the city is an entry entitled "Expenses for participation of the City Council in the festival of the patron saints." For years this entry did not appear, but in January last public opinion pressed so hard on the city authorities that they were forced to introduce the former customs and "respect tradition." Quite a bill was incurred for the purpose of obtaining new gala uniforms, at the expense of the city, in honor of said saints. The second example may be found in the city of Catania, in Sicily, which boasts of the honor of possessing the body of Saint Agatha, who protects the city as a patron saint. Her festival is one of a very magnificent character, in which the worldly and the spiritual meet in strange medley. The silver coffin of the saint is borne along in solemn procession, while crowds of men and women, clad in long white robes, follow it with loud cries and fantastic demonstrations. These festivities, that last for about a week, resemble the Saturnalia and the Bacchanalia of the ancient Romans. After some years of absence the city authorities appeared at the last one in February. The municipal buildings were adorned with immense figures and wax tapers, and the councilors, clothed in gay garbs, took part in the procession. We need scarcely say that this

return to the Saturnalia by the Church is regarded with apprehension by the general government.

THE JEWISH QUESTION IN GERMANY.

Although we hear of but few external conflicts in Germany with the Jews, there is, nevertheless, no actual truce between the combatants; the strife is being waged on a deeper basis. A great many German Publicists are in the field, some discussing the atheistic character of the anti-Semitic leaders, and others attacking even Luther for having given the Jewish Bible to the people as a means of advancing the Reformation. One author still harps upon the question of the biblical proof of shedding virgin blood in sacrifice. To him and his school Delitzsch replies in a work, entitled "Latest Visions of the Anti-Semitic Prophet," in which he proves that no assertion of this kind can be found. Here, even, three Catholic theologians enter the field, decidedly contesting such a translation of any real or supposed book of the Bible. Dr. Lehnhardt gives us a very good review of the progress of the anti-Semitic movement. He acknowledges that though its course is now quiet its channel is very deep. His remedy for the trouble is mixed marriage of Jews and Christians, in which he would find the only means of reconciliation between the two opposing elements.

A new field of activity is found in the so-called "Institutes" of the students in many of the universities. These societies have been formed at Leipzig, Halle, Erlangen, Breslau, Berlin, and other cities. A young theologian is a special enthusiast in this work, endeavoring to awaken among Christians a mission zeal and activity for Israel. The Leipzig Institute is now engaged in publishing pamphlets on the Jewish question.

In the midst of this war with the pen, the feeling in the Jewish camp seems at present divided; yet those writers seem best to reach the ear of the Jewish multitude who speak quieting words to them, and encourage their self-consciousness. An anonymous pamphlet, entitled "Why Do We Not Embrace Christianity?" has obtained no hearing among them. The common complaint is cast into their faces from every direction, that of the labor that all nations have to perform they are sure to choose the most agreeable and profitable. The statistics of the Jews of Berlin show that while eight per cent. of them enter the so-called liberal professions, eighty-five per cent. enter commercial callings, and the merest fraction thus adopt manual labor for a support. Or, while, according to the number of Jews in Breslau, 2,000 should enter the elementary schools, only 500 of them are there, while the remaining 1,500 enter the higher schools; three fourths of the entire number, therefore, press into the higher occupations. Another very unacceptable fact is the immigration of Jews from abroad into Prussia. So many of these come from Posen and other outlying districts to Berlin, that they form at least one fourth of the entire Jewish population of the capital. A large number of these foreign Jews seem to come simply to make rapid and

prosperous commercial ventures, and then retire. The social and intellectual growth of that great city thus clearly depends largely on the development of the Jewish question, which will certainly remain a very active one, and a very caustic and dangerous one, for some time to come.

CITY MISSION WORK ABROAD.

There is a wonderful activity in the line of city mission work in several European capitals, whose pastors and zealous laymen are waking up to the fact that the mass of the people will not crowd into the State churches, and that if they are to be reached at all by Christian effort they must be pursued. The famous court preacher of Berlin, Dr. Stöcker, is proving to be a noble leader in this aggressive Christianity. He acknowledges that the German capital has but few Christian congregations, churches, and preachers, and calls on the city mission work to supply these needs. He appeals not to the state, but to the people, for money, and generally finds by the end of the year that providential gifts make his accounts even. He began with a comparatively small yearly demand, but last year pleaded for $25,000, and received very nearly that sum. He has workers visiting individuals and families, and reports about 60,000 visits annually. The number of the children in the mission Sunday-schools has increased to over 3,000, and the individual assemblies of young people and adults have grown very noticeably. The enterprise is now extending its work to the suburbs, and Dr. Stöcker is calling for 100 city missionaries. When the individual missionary work was begun, a few years ago, the workers were received with rudeness, or even insult; now they report no coarse words, and declare the hatred toward the Church to be rapidly disappearing. The best proof of the influence exerted is shown in the increased number of marriages and baptisms, the percentage of these being far greater than in other German cities to which this mission work has not extended. Their mode of operation is seen in the increased activity of the clergy, in the extension of the system of deaconesses, and in the publication of circulars, appeals, and tracts of the Evangelical Association, of which their last report gives the following figures: 60,246 tracts, 161,403 sermons, 5,403 subscriptions to religious periodicals, especially the very popular and excellent "Berlin Sunday Journal." The society during the last year sold 225 Bibles, gave away 78, sold 1,045 New Testaments, gave away 583, and gave and sold about 8,000 Prayer-books. Small as this report may seem to us, who have long cherished this work in our great cities, it is large and encouraging for those to whom the work is new, and in the city where infidel and atheistic tendencies are so rife and aggressive among the masses.

Art. XII.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

The latest work of Padre Curci, who was some time ago expelled from the Order of Jesus, but who still claims to be a priest, is very severe on the Pope. It is entitled "The Vatican Desiring a Royal Throne:—A Worm Still Gnawing Within the Catholic Church." Curci declares that the peculiar misfortune of the papacy and papal Church is the desire to continue the temporal power, because the loss of this now places the Pope in the highly undignified attitude of a pretender. The present condition of the Christian Church, he urges, will no longer tolerate such commingling of powers; and so long as the Vatican will not cease these claims, so long will it fail to possess the sympathy of the noblest spirits among the Catholics themselves, and will prepare for itself humiliation after humiliation from the direction of the secular powers. Curci dedicates his work to the young clergy and the thoughtful laical world. To such laymen and priests Curci may do much good through his book, for they can draw from it many good lessons. In former times the laymen found a pleasure in seeing the priests rich and powerful, clothed in purple and fine linen, sparkling with precious stones, and driving like lords in magnificent coaches, with proud lackeys. To-day, fortunately, the intelligent world finds no pleasure in such displays, but rather despises and condemns them. Such clergy as Curci would train up—rich in knowledge, modesty, and feeling—are those that are not wanted by the papacy of to-day; and consequently the Vatican condemns this book and curses this keen and courageous old man in the most caustic terms.

In view of the above, a very timely publication is the "History of the Index Expurgatorius," by Professor Reusch, of Bonn. It is highly interesting to follow this historian in his investigation of the catalogues of forbidden books in all Catholic countries. In the first class of the *Index* are the authors whose entire writings are condemned; some of these are innocent jurists, who perhaps in only one single instance had censured the canonical law of marriage; or they are authors of lexicons and grammars, who through typographical errors or some misunderstanding have made themselves unacceptable. There are some special investigations as to the position in the *Index* of men like Savonarola, Macchiavelli, and Boccaccio. Among the details are to be found, the history of the suit of the Inquisition against the Archbishop Carranza of Toledo, on account of his *Cathecismo Cristiano*, and the discussion of the Ten Rules of the *Index* of Trent. This is claimed to be the first book published in regard to the famous *Index*, on which it throws a good deal of light.

In truth, Catholicism is receiving rather more than its due meed of attention in the publications of the day, a fact that shows how keen is the public appreciation of the ecclesiastical situation. Professor

Nippold, who has just been promoted from Berne to Jena, has lately published the second volume of his "Manual of Modern Church History." The first volume, published three years ago, contained the introduction to the Church History of the nineteenth century; this second volume gives the History of Catholicism since the restoration of the papacy. The story of this is neither more nor less than the increasing power of the Order of Jesus, and the progressive permeation of the Catholic Church with the spirit of Jesuitism within and without; the assumption and extension of power in the line of temporal rule; with a state policy that ever fails in the means and rarely reaches the goal. The author brings to light many facts and arguments which prove that the Vatican is threatening the Christian world and its missionary efforts with much danger. The author, who possesses a comprehensive knowledge of facts, gives us not simply a mere collection of these, but extends his observations to the more deeply-lying causes that produce events, and the impulses that control their course.

Heinrich Atte's "Archæology of Christian Art" is a well-known and highly esteemed work. It has been growing on his hands for many years, and in 1877, by the conflagation of his home, he lost in a few hours the weary labors, collections, and books that formed his fund of treasures for a revised edition of his work. But notwithstanding his age and physical exhaustion, he determined to go again through the labors of a new and enlarged edition, and this he now gives to the world. He divides it into sections, headed "The Church Edifice," "The Internal Arrangement and Adornment of the Churches," "Church Heraldry," etc. These are merely the central points around which he groups the most manifold subdivisions. The bewildering mass of details indicates an admirable diligence, a thorough collecting, and a careful sifting and working of the whole. The profoundest student can here hardly be left in doubt in regard to any question. The first impression of the reader, as the last, is astonishment at the bee-like industry of the author. From this minute perfection of details, we need scarcely say that the work is not adapted to the mere *dilettants* of Christian art. And for a like reason it is no mere guide for the beginner in the study of Christian archæology. But for the advanced student, it forms an inestimable fund of this species of knowledge, and is an indispensable manual for his investigations.

A new oriental journal, bearing the title of "Journal for Cuneiform Studies and Filial Subjects," has been begun by two orientalists of the University of Munich, which promises to be a very useful adjunct in this line of learned investigation. It is published quarterly, and bears a somewhat international character, in so far as it is intended for investigators of the Arrow-head Inscriptions in France, England, and our own country. The text will be mainly German, but the editors propose to give articles in the English and French languages, and also in Italian. To judge from the contents of the specimen number, the best

representatives of this line of study will appear in its pages and contribute to its success. Among the authors in this number, we find the names of Schrader, Guiard, Sayce, Appart, Hálévy, and others. The Journal promises, according to the articles announced in its Prospectus, to give monographic descriptions of the west Asiatic religions, art, and culture, paying most attention to the Babylonian and Assyrian and Christo-theological interests. If it carries out its programme, it will be a very desirable scientific adjunct to its older colleague in Germany, namely, "The German Oriental Journal for Egyptology."

The Rector of the German and Swiss school in Constantinople publishes an interesting monogram in the archives of Christian art of 1884, entitled "A Subterranean Byzantine Church." This proves to be the narrative of a very interesting "*find*," which he has made a few miles eastward from ancient Chalcedon, on the shore of the Sea of Marmora, in the coast region of Bithynia. It is a description of a hillock of refuse and earth covering a small church with a low cupola on a quadrangular site. It is surrounded by four halls covered with arches which terminate at the four corners in little chapels with small domes. An oblong court leads into the little church, which is destitute of windows, and therefore from the beginning must have been planned for artificial lighting. Around the church are grouped the remains of rectangular walls, which may point to the earlier existence of a cloister. The peculiar connection of the dome with the quadrangular surface by the rounding of the inner walls indicates, according to the narrator, that the origin of the structure is to be laid in the most ancient period of oriental church architecture, perhaps, therefore, in the sixth century. As the building is not entirely exhumed, a more accurate description cannot yet be given.

Samuel Gobat, the late Protestant Bishop of Jerusalem, has found a biographer who performs a very acceptable task in giving to the world the information that he has been able to collect in regard to this worthy and noted man. The Bishop himself had previously published a diary of his life in Abyssinia up to the period when he entered on his episcopal office in Jerusalem, and then a portion of his biography was to be found only in manuscript in his own hand, written not for publicity, but for the satisfaction of his own family circle. His youngest daughter made a German translation of the English original for the press. The material for the later portion of his life is supplied by Gobat's circulars and the reports of others, especially of his own children and of a reverend friend. Professor Thiersch gathered and arranged all the material for this book. The impression made by the biography in regard to the personality of Gobat is very clear and emphatic. His pure evangelical piety, his deep humility, his unusual measure of self-sacrifice, his ceaseless struggle for the welfare of souls, even outside of the limits of his own Church, made him a man capable beyond most others to be a path-breaker for evangelical Christianity and life in the depressed Orient.

And he deserves the greater appreciation because much of the opposition to him, and indeed his greatest troubles, came from the circle of his own English Church. The Germans entertain a high respect for him because of his peculiar relations with Frederick William IV., through whose patronage and care he was placed and maintained in his peculiar position. It appears from this biography that it was the wish of the Prussian king to have the first bishops of the newly organized Prussian Church consecrated by him. The closing pages of the work give a short review of the present condition of the Protestant diocese of Jerusalem.

ART. XIII.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

Annual Theological Review. Current Discussions in Theology. By the Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary. Volume II. 12mo, pp. 324. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell.

More than a year ago, three of the professors of Chicago Theological Seminary (Congregational) issued a small volume entitled "Current Discussions," which they designed should be the first of a series of annual publications from that institution, giving some account of the trend of biblical and theological thought and discussions during the last preceding year. The second of the series is now before the public, and the whole six members of the faculty unite in its production, each contributing a "Part" having reference to his own specialty.

Part I, by Professor Samuel Ives Curtis, having the general title, "Present State of Old Testament Studies," and the more definite one, "The History of Israel," occupies about sixty pages, and is one of the most noticeable divisions of the volume. The subject is just now the leading one in the whole world of biblical learning, and it is here treated by a specially able hand. The design appears to be simply to indicate the state of the subject as it exists among the most "advanced," which means the most skeptical and destructive school of critics in the German universities. The situation is outlined with a good share of learning, and with a judicial freedom from bias that seems to be at once clear and exceedingly cold, scarcely giving any indication of the writer's own attitude in respect to the matters of which he writes. Its atmosphere is altogether that of the least evangelical of the German universities, and it apparently "gives away" the cause of

the supernatural religionists, by tacitly allowing the unwarrantable positions of the rationalists to stand unchallenged as they choose to present them. The positions of such critics as Ewald, Wellhausen, Stade, Robertson Smith, and others of the same school of thought, are brought prominently into view, but those of writers of opposite views are very little noticed. The exhibit made is, no doubt, a correct one as to the details given; but as a representation of the subject in hand, as it exists among the great body of Protestant scholars and theologians, it is manifestly one-sided and untruthful. There often appears a strange tendency among our biblical and theological scholars to give the advantage in every discussion to the enemies of the Bible and of evangelical orthodoxy. No doubt there is great need of a thorough and searching re-examination of the Old Testament, and it is the duty of our Christian scholars to engage in that work; but there is no good reason why the whole case should be virtually surrendered by uncalled-for concessions before the issue is fairly joined.

The second division of the department of Exegetical Theology, that of the New Testament, by Professor J. T. Hyde, is in quite a different tone from that of the former. The fight about the New Testament, which was precipitated by the publication of Strauss's "Life of Jesus," half a century ago, may be set down as fully determined, with the complete discomfiture of the assailants, but not without driving the defenders out of not a few of the indefensible positions formerly occupied by them. The present state of New Testament learning, which has become popularized in connection with the publication of the Revised Version, is altogether a satisfactory one, and the whole subject is very well outlined in the nearly fifty pages here devoted to it.

In Part II, Exegetical Theology, Professor H. M. Scott details the condition of the subject as it now exists in Germany, with an almost absolute disregard of any other portion of the Church or the world. The state of things among the New Lutherans and the "Unionists" is briefly and rapidly sketched, and then the "New Rationalistic Theology," which is shown to be a medley of all sorts of opinions, agreed upon among themselves only as to their common rejection of and contempt for the cherished opinions of evangelical Christians. The case is stated very calmly and clearly—no doubt fairly—and the reader is left to guess what may be the writer's personal estimate of the issues described, and whether or not he has any preference respecting the estimates that his readers may make of the questions discussed.

All this may be very well, if it is to be understood that it is no part of the duty of a theological professor to vindicate the truth of what he is set to teach.

Part III, Systematic Theology, by Professor George N. Bowman, is devoted to the consideration of Theism and Revelation, and a chapter is given to each of these subjects. The first discusses Professor Hicks's "Design Argument," examining especially his idea of the Absolute, and closing with the unanswered question, whether or not the view there given is tenable. The second chapter is, in like manner, devoted to Professor Ladd's recent book on the "Sacred Scriptures," which is ably handled, and some very good suggestions brought out; but, as if giving any intimation of what is correct or incorrect in it would be an impertinence, the writer is very careful to avoid any thing determinative, though his leaning toward the better side may, at some points, be detected.

Part IV, Practical Theology, (about preaching,) by Professor F. W. Fisk, is much more within the range of every-day life. Much that is given is excellent, but some of his suggestions may be safely subjected to further consideration. About the same criticism might apply to Part V, Pastoral Theology, (Church work,) which treats of the "how" and the requisite appliances for carrying forward, successfully and pleasantly, the proper affairs of "a conjugation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is [should be] preached, and the sacraments duly administered."

The design and plan of this "annual" appear to us to be especially a happy conception, and the execution of the work, as purposed by its authors, is well done; but its matter suggests a reason why so many of the younger ministers of the Congregational churches appear to be wholly adrift in respect to nearly all the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. It would be an excellent service could one or more of our own theological faculties give to us a similar production, but without its dubiousness of theological opinions.

Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology, on the Basis of Hagenbach. By GEORGE R. CROOKS, D.D., and JOHN F. HURST, D.D. 8vo, pp. 596. New York: Phillips & Hunt. 1884.

The "Library of Biblical and Theological Literature," projected by the Methodist Book Concern at New York several years ago, advances apace, and we are enabled to announce, as above, the

publication of another—the third—of its volumes. In respect to thoroughness and breadth of scholarship, this work must prove equal to the largest requirements, and the author's grasp of his subject as a whole, and his mastery of its details, cannot fail to prove entirely satisfactory. Of all this the name of Hagenbach is a sufficient guarantee, for in his chosen departments of theological learning he has no superior, even in Germany. The book thus given to English-speaking readers is a valuable contribution to the available resources for thorough theological investigations, with special reference to the practical work of the Gospel ministry.

We name the work as Hagenbach's, for such it is, not only as to its "basis," but also, for the most part, in respect to its substance and superstructure. It is thoroughly German in its style and modes of thought and methods of statement, and its outlook upon its themes of discussion is made from a German standpoint. It is simply Hagenbach's "Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology" translated from the German into good, idiomatic English, and somewhat supplemented and otherwise modified by the American editors. Its cumbrous and pedantic title would be more intelligible if made to read, "The Methods and Substance of Theological Study."

A not unfriendly critic, and one altogether competent to give judgment in such a case, whose words have just now come under our eye, remarks at this point, and we fully indorse his "putting" as our own:

> It is so essentially German in its thought and method, that English and American scholars will treat it as serving only a temporary convenience, and will all the more desire an independent and original treatise. It is not difficult to believe that the accomplished editors, Drs. Crooks and Hurst, could have produced a better work by making less use of Hagenbach, and elaborating from their abundant stores of knowledge an entirely new Theological Encyclopædia. English [speaking] divines have no need of appropriating; nor is it desirable to give currency in our tongue to a terminology so dim as [that here used.] Friendly criticism may also allege that the bewildering mass of German bibliography appended to the several sections of this volume will scarcely serve any useful purpose to the American student. A large proportion of the works referred to are inaccessible to most American scholars; and, while the references serve to indicate the vast amount of brain-work that has been bestowed upon these subjects, and are themselves a means of literary culture, a less extensive and more select bibliography would seem to have better suited the purposes of an introductory handbook for American and English theological students.

The strange absence of any such work in our language, of a later date or more adequate character than Bickersteth's "Christian Student," which was first published more than fifty years ago, may fully justify the reproduction in an English dress of such a specimen of the latest and maturest Christian scholarship,

even though its speech and its thoughts "bewray" its alien character. But it seems especially desirable that, as above intimated, it shall be accepted as only a "temporary convenience," and that Dr. Crooks, or some one else equally competent—if such another can be found—shall without any unnecessary delay set about preparing the much-needed work. With very many real excellences, which, however, are marred in respect to their practical use by their form and methods of statement, there are not wanting also in this work manifest defects, and also damaging misconceptions of the requisite personal qualifications for entering upon the work of the ministry; and it may be devoutly hoped that the ideas upon this subject which prevail in any of the State Churches of Europe will not soon become naturalized among us.

System of Christian Theology. By HENRY B. SMITH, D.D., LL.D. Edited by WILLIAM S. KARR, D.D., Professor of Theology in Hartford Theological Seminary. 8vo, pp. 630. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son.

Professor H. B. Smith was no doubt among the very best thinkers and writers, in theology, of the recent past, or rather of the present, for by his works he is still among men. Thoroughly scholarly, as to his reading and study of broad and liberal views and modes of thinking, yet a firm believer, and devotedly attached to the theological system in which he had been educated—a modified Calvinism—to harmonize which with his own broader and more scriptural views of divine truth was his life-work, the present volume is his best monument. But it is his own only as the temple was David's; for as David gathered the materials and Solomon built the temple, so the matter of this treatise was prepared by him whose name it bears, but its form and structure is the work of the editor.

As a system of theology this work is eminently scriptural, orthodox, and evangelical. That the author comes to his task with strong and intelligent predilections toward certain methods of viewing and stating Christian doctrine is every-where manifest, and these determine his relations to existing theological schools of thought. He is an Augustinian, and yet he avoids the peculiarities of Augustine's notions on such points as the *realism* of sin and righteousness, and his process of sinking the individual man and merging all his spiritual interests, for time and eternity, in the consolidated federation of the race. He is a Calvinist as to the positive side of that system, but not so as

to the negative side; for while he insists upon the doctrine of the divine predestination, he also holds to the freedom of the human will, really and practically; and he claims that it is not unreasonable for us to suppose that the apparent antagonism of these two postulates is only apparent, and that beyond the range of our vision they perfectly harmonize. A special excellence of this work is the clearness—the cleanness—of the style of the writing, and of the mode of stating the several propositions, indicating the completeness of the author's processes of thought upon the subjects discussed. Obscurity in writing is more frequently the result of incomplete mental processes than of lack of facility in the use of language; and it is quite evident that in this case every thought had been completely formulated in the mental laboratory before it was committed to writing. And yet here, as in nearly every system of theology, a large share of what is set forth has been accepted simply because it is the traditional faith of the Church, and not because such points have been thoroughly examined, each upon its own evidence. This is perhaps unavoidable, but it suggests the thought that not improbably some of these accepted points may yet be called in question, and, after more adequate inquiry, modified or rejected. There remains very much land to be explored by rational and devout free-thinking.

A Higher Catechism of Theology. By WILLIAM BURT POPE, D.D. 12mo, pp. 389. New York: Phillips and Hunt. $1 50.

A complete apparatus for theological instruction and study consists of three grades of books: The Catechism proper; the Higher Catechism, or a summary of doctrines; and Systematic Theology, or the full statement of Christian doctrine, duly elaborated. The first and the last of these have been largely provided by Methodist authors, and issued from the Methodist press; but for the second no adequate provision has heretofore been made. The want of such a work has been felt and confessed, and some attempts have been made to supply it, but hitherto without satisfactory results. Dr. Pope's great work having been selected as the standard text-book of theology for the use of the junior preachers of the Methodist ministry, it is well that the epitomized form of doctrines comes from the same hand; and accordingly this work has been prepared, certainly with marked conscientiousness, as well as with distinguished ability. As a theological writer, Dr. Pope is scholarly,

conservative, and painstaking. Doctrinally he is a Wesleyan of the strictest type, and especially of the school of Watson, with whose positions, as set forth in the "Institutes," he is nearly always in strict accord. His Arminianism is that of Arminius himself, rather than that of the later Remonstrants; and in some important particulars he is not entirely in harmony with some of our later American Methodist writers: notably in respect to the nature of sin, and of atonement, and of free-will; on which points he is more nearly Augustinian, and they relatively nearer to Pelagianism. He also makes a somewhat larger account of the sacraments, as in some way connected with the bestowment of salvation. By reason of his thorough acquaintance with the subject of Christian doctrine, Dr. Pope is well prepared to set it forth in its details and in systematic order. The catechetical form enables him to particularize at every point, and to give his definitions and mark distinctions of thought with great clearness. His business is not to support what he declares by either Scripture or reason, but to set forth what he conceives to be the plain teaching of God's word in direct and easily intelligible terms. The catechist is assumed to know what he teaches, and the catechumen is supposed to be a subject of instruction, coming to be taught, and not for debate. Discussions and disputations may have their uses, but the Christian teacher must often depend chiefly upon the essential reasonableness and adaptation of what he declares, rather than upon external proofs and logical demonstrations; and for his purpose the simple didactic forms of the catechism is peculiarly well adapted. It has been matter of complaint that the Methodist laity, and especially the younger portion of them, are not well taught in the doctrines of their Church; and as a cause of this, the want of a concise manual of doctrine has been alleged, but that matter of complaint must now cease. This "Higher Catechism" ought to be made a text-book in the young people's classes in our Sunday-schools.

The Great Argument; or, Jesus Christ in the Old Testament. By WILLIAM H. THOMSON, M.A., M.D., Professor in the Medical Department of the University of the City of New York. 8vo, pp. 471. New York: Harper & Brothers.

A more egregious mistake has seldom been made, even by its mistaking promoters, than the assumption that the Old Testament has ceased to be useful for the defense of the Gospel—perhaps rather a burden and a hinderance. As sometimes interpreted by

certain super-fiducial literalists, it might, indeed, become such; but read and expounded by any reverent and rationally critical mind, its value in Christian apologetics, and not less so in scriptural exegesis, is beyond estimate. And with this view of the subject we hail with real pleasure the appearance of the work named above. Its double title is especially significant, as it assumes that the revelation of Christ in the Old Testament is indeed the great and divinely purposed argument in favor of the Truth. To this our Lord himself referred the caviling Jews, and out of these sacred books of the Jews the apostles alleged and proved that Jesus was the Christ.

The author of the book now in hand is a son of the author of "The Land and the Book," and himself lived during the susceptible period of his youth among the scenes of the Holy Land. Retaining the impressions of his childhood, he now, in mature manhood, is turning them to account in deducing from them instructions respecting the great truths of whose manifestation Palestine was the arena. The argument itself is not different in either its substance or its form from what has often been given; but in respect to both the fullness of the proofs adduced and to the forms in which they are presented, it excels any that we have seen elsewhere. The Introduction, filling over forty pages, gives the external conditions of the subject in hand, so showing the force and pertinency of the following array of proofs; and the twelve following chapters present a succession of arguments whose combined force constitutes the highest kind of a demonstration, because, "to him gave all the prophets witness." As a Christology of the Old Testament, we have seen nothing that so fully and satisfactorily meets the demands of the case.

The Parables of Jesus. A Methodical Exposition. By SIEGFRIED GOEBAL, Court Chaplain in Halberstadt. Translated by Prof. BANKS HEADINGLY. 8vo, pp. 455. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford.

The purpose of the writer in composing this scholarly work was "to avoid the usual arbitrariness in the treatment of the Parables, and to investigate their original meaning under the guidance of a thorough, methodical, and exact exposition." Not finding in German theological literature any such exegetical treatment of these interesting portions of the Gospel, he undertook to supply the lack himself. His translator informs us that his work "has won considerable favor in Germany," a fact which of

itself is no mean commendation. Dr. Weiss gives it credit for "solid exegesis, sound judgment, and sober, skillful interpretation," albeit he censures its author for his disregard of the results of modern "criticism," and for his "diffuse, involved style." The first of these censures will be accepted as one of his conspicuous merits by the evangelical reader; the second he will regret, since, despite the effort of the translator to modify his style, it is still tedious and lacking in perspicuity. To some its purely German character will add to its value; while others will regret that its author did not avail himself of the aids he might have found in the valuable expositions of English writers. To the student who seeks not fanciful and unnatural interpretations, or merely edifying applications of the Parables of Jesus, but a sound exegesis which aims to give "the simple, original sense which the parable had in the mouth of Jesus in relation to those to whom he delivered it," this volume will be highly esteemed. W.

Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Epistles to the Corinthians. By HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, Th.D., Oberconsistorialrath, Hannover. Translated from the Fifth Edition of the German, by Rev. D. DOUGLAS BANNERMAN, M.A. The Translation Revised and Edited by WILLIAM P. DICKSON, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow. With a Preface and Supplementary Notes, by TALBOT W. CHAMBERS, D.D. 8vo, pp. 720. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

Meyer's Critical and Exegetical Commentary deservedly stands among the very first of its class. It is eminently learned, judicial in its spirit, and judicious in its evangelical tone and doctrinal decisions. It is especially to be commended for the fidelity with which the results of sound criticism are accepted, without respect to traditional or ecclesiastical prepossessions; and yet it is uniformly reverent in its spirit and evangelical in its conclusions. In company with Alford's "Greek Testament," we have long made it our hand-book for the study of the New Testament, and have found both satisfaction and profit in its use.

This new edition, the first in this country, has several special features, some of them of considerable importance, and adding to the practical value of the work. The translation has been improved at a variety of points, and generally better conformed to the English idioms; and both the preface and the supplementary notes by Dr. Chambers are real and valuable additions. The work, as a whole, is a store-house of New Testament learning which every Bible student should possess and study thoroughly.

Theology of the Old Testament. By Dr. GUSTAV FRIEDRICH OEHLER, of the Evangelical Theological Seminary in Tübingen. A Revision of the Translation in Clark's Foreign Theological Library, with the Additions of the Second German Edition, an Introduction and Notes, by George E. Day, Professor of Biblical Theology in Yale College. 8vo, pp. 594. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

The battle of the giants about the Old Testament is not only begun, but is already well advanced. On the side of the assailants, as chiefs, stand Kuenen and Wellhausen and W. Robertson Smith, a trio of champions of destructive criticism, learned and skilled in controversy, and quite unrestrained by any undue reverence for the traditional faith. They are foemen worthy of the steel of any others, and are not to be put off by a shrug or a proverb. The defense advances more slowly, but not less surely, and forward among its champions is Oehler, whose great work, by the favor of its American editor and publishers, is brought within easy reach of those who use only their vernacular, without loss by its transmission into English, which could not be so well said of the Edinburgh edition. No account of the contents of the work can be given in the few lines that we can devote to this notice. It is enough to say that it is the one great work which effectually covers the whole field of the question at issue, and successfully controverts the strange positions of its antagonists. Let no one consider himself master of the question who has not thoroughly read and digested this remarkable production, to do which will be a work of weeks and months.

Biblical Lights and Side Lights. Ten Thousand Illustrations, with Thirty Thousand Cross References, consisting of Facts, Incidents, and Remarkable Declarations taken from the Bible. By Rev. CHARLES E. LITTLE. 8vo, pp. 632. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

A help toward Bible references and textual quotations, midway between a concordance and a commentary, and having some of the properties of each. As a concordance, it is of ideas and subjects rather than of words, so as to enable one to find some text or passage of Scripture on any given subject that he may have in mind. The work, which must be the result of immense study and painstaking, appears to be much more than a compilation of passages strung together by merely verbal likenesses; it is rather a rationally arranged comparison of subjects and texts, the latter taken in their proper meaning. It is a work of very much merit, and will prove a valuable labor-saving manual in consulting the divine word. It is well printed on good paper, and is altogether such a book as the Bible reader will find useful.

History, Biography, and Topography.

Life of James Buchanan. By GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS. Two vols., 8vo. Vol. i, pp. 625; vol. ii, pp. 707. New York: Harper & Bros. 1883.

The mind of the American people is made up about the fifteenth President of the United States. The verdict was rendered in 1860, and is uncomplimentary. The unfavorable judgment of thirty millions of people is at no time a trifle. A greater punishment than the subject could bear, it suggested a political *Apologia pro Vita Sua.* That autobiographical plea, however, made little impression upon public opinion. Indeed, the thirty millions seemed to feel that the less said about the administration of 1857–61 the better for its author. No one saw this more clearly than the person himself. It is all the more pathetic, therefore, to learn that even in the closing hours of his life he clung to the vague hope that the day would come when his country would reverse its passionate decision.

A quarter of a century has now elapsed. An appeal to re-open the case cannot be called premature. If the former judgment was heated by an excited period, there has been time to cool. Moreover, a new generation has appeared in the jury-box. Candor must compel a common confession that this book cannot be said to harbinger the day of exoneration and long-delayed praise for which the expiring President yearned. That is no fault of the biography.

Disclaiming any previous personal interest in the fame of his subject, Mr. Curtis's political sympathy has nevertheless quite compensated for the lack of actual acquaintance and attachment. It is for no friendlier biographer yet to come to portray this character in that warmth of personal sympathy to which every public character is justly entitled. No writer in future will be more thorough and patient, or will be able to procure ampler *memorabilia* on which to base still another life. Mr. Buchanan's voluminous correspondence, his private journals, and his full memoranda of all his important conversations leave nothing lacking in the way of data.

Mr. Curtis has done the public a service in writing this life. His work will go far toward changing antipathy into pity. Few can read without emotion the record of the peculiar domestic sorrow that clouded Mr. Buchanan's young manhood. All will follow him with solicitude on his mission to St. Petersburg,

where, without previous experience, he was to cope with the most accomplished diplomatic fencers in the world, and will feel a patriotic pride in the ability and address which secured the first commercial treaty with Russia, an advantage which England's best politicians had sought in vain. None will miss the deft argumentative ability displayed at the Ostend Conference in defense of the alleged right of the United States to seize Cuba in the interest of the slave power, though few readers will escape sadness that such ability could be enlisted in such a cause. Many will be moved with sorrow, too, when noting the vile and cruel slanders that assailed the President in the crisis of his political life. All talk of his disloyalty or conscious collusion with traitors will be scouted. His stainless moral character, his purity of speech, his chivalrous and reverential bearing toward the gentler sex, his habits of secret prayer and Bible-reading, will lay hold of the reader's heart.

When he draws near the crucial hour of his destiny, the era of secession, we have no sinister distrust or suspicion of him. After granting all of Mr. Curtis's extenuating circumstances—the attitude of Congress—the President's construction of the constitution—the Northern incredulity as to the seriousness of the crisis, the residuum is the old conviction of the people, that the brilliant diplomatist and able constitutional lawyer lacked something. Mr. Curtis tells us that we ought not to talk about what might have been done. We cannot help it. We cannot avoid speculating what Abraham Lincoln would have done as President when South Carolina seceded, or what would have been James Buchanan's policy if Fort Sumter had been fired upon prior to March, 1861. Would the latter, in the face of the hurricane of wrath that arose in the Northern sky, have stood in the face of it arguing constitutional limitations? No man can tell. If we were as confident as some of the divine nescience, we should say that Providence dared not permit the experiment.

We hesitate about our resolution of thanks to Mr. Curtis. He has given us a personal friend undoubtedly; but he has added therewith a new pang also. He has told us how, at their final parting, the Czar embraced him, and that when Queen Victoria met him once upon a time "an arch but benevolent smile lit her countenance." We, too, cannot withhold our smile and embrace. But, alas! our biographer has convinced us also that in the hour of our nation's peril our friend fell short of that greatness the country had a right to expect from him. M. D. B.

Centenary Thoughts for the Pew and Pulpit of Methodism, in Eighteen Hundred and Eighty-four. By R. S. FOSTER, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe.

Surely a suggestive book, whether regarded as an exponent of what Episcopal Methodism has become, the means by which its past victories have been won, or as a shadower-forth of what it is fondly hoped may be its position when its second centennial shall dawn.

Some of the "Thoughts" dwelt in the author's mind long years ago, and were first uttered by him in the hearing of his brethren of the New York Conference on occasion of the centennial celebration of Methodism in 1866. Others of them have been uttered by him on various occasions since, especially when, as one of the chief pastors of the Church, he has addressed bodies assembled as Annual and Lay Conferences. But all of them have been more recently transmuted in the alembic of a deeper spiritual laboratory, and are now given as fitting words to the incitement of the Church to the divising of great things for God at the close of this first century of her history.

The author has cast these "Centenary Thoughts" in three molds, or classes. In the first is comprised a rapid and vivid sketch of the numerical and potential advance of the Church in the hundred years just closing, and in its influence for good upon other religious bodies. From this section we make the following brief extract:

> It [Methodism] was conspicuously an awakening of spiritual consciousness, which has been felt along all the lines of theological thought, and which has radically affected the conception of religion, and of fundamental doctrines throughout Christendom. No creed has been untouched by it. It is believed that it has done more to rectify theology in the matter of God's sovereignty and man's responsibility, the doctrines of sin, of atonement, [and] of human freedom, than [have] all other agencies put together.

The second class of "Thoughts" is largely made up of meditations suited especially "for the Pulpit." These have mainly to do with the duties and qualifications of the ministry of the Church. Here the author says:

> Personal ministerial character is so important an integer, that I beg to devote a moment longer at this point. He that teaches holiness must himself be holy. He that would move men toward holiness must himself be centered in holiness. The force that lifts men must be from above, and yet must be in the preacher People instinctively demand that religious teachers shall have the odor of sanctity about them. Nor is the semblance, however complete, sufficient. Souls have a way of knowing when souls speak to them. They infallibly discern between mere sound and the power which comes from the core of a great honest feeling. Out of the depths of the soul come the forces which move to moral revolutions.

The third division of the book is termed "Thoughts for the Pew." Here the Bishop comes near to the heart and the home of the Church at large, and urges it to the performance of its high and holy duty as becomes one who must himself "give account to God." Hear and heed him:

> Cultivate love for generous deeds: it will broaden and deepen your manhood, it will give tone and richness to your piety, it will heighten and brighten your life. . . . In the house of God there are no distinctions. The poor and the rich meet together, and one God is Father of them all. The words of the lowly, seasoned with grace, are often fullest of comfort. . . . The spiritual work of the Christian is not limited to the sanctuary. It has to do with your closet and with your family life. Keep the fires burning by the daily supply of fuel from the closet and the family altar. Be priests in your homes. Wrestle with God for your children. Let grace appear in such loveliness in you that your children will be attracted by it. Let the sermon of your life and temper back up every exhortation of the pulpit. More than any body else be the evangel in your own household.

We heartily commend the book to all "the people called Methodists," and urge that at least one copy shall be found in every family of the thousands of our Israel. J. L.

Brahmoism; or, History of Reformed Hinduism, from Its Origin in 1830, under Rajah Mohun Roy, to the Present Time, with a Particular Account of Babu Keshub Chunder Sen's Connection with the Movement. By RAM CHANDRA BOSE, M.A., of Lucknow, India. 12mo, pp. 222. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

The author of this little volume, an educated Hindu, has twice visited this country as a delegate from the Methodist Mission Conference in India to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. As a native of that country and a convert from Hinduism, his views may be accepted as from the inside rather than the outside of the subject. His estimate of the Brahmo Somaj, and of its great apostle, Keshub Chunder Sen, are less exalted than have been taken by some Europeans. The book is worthy of the attention of all who would obtain a clear and comprehensive notion both of this somewhat remarkable person and his sect.

John Foster: Life and Thoughts. With Copious Index. By W. W. EVERTS, D.D. 8vo, pp. 207. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.

Foster was a remarkable man; a profound but solitary thinker; religious but without religious joy; and, though a minister of the Gospel of great simplicity and sincerity, yet he was evidently not well adapted to the "cure of souls." He has evidently found an appreciative editor in Dr. Everts, and the book here produced is honorable to both the parties.

Miscellaneous.

Index to the Methodist Quarterly Review. Including "The Methodist Magazine," and "The Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review," 1818–1881. By ELIJAH H. PILCHER, D.D. 8vo, pp. 339. New York: Phillips and Hunt.

The current number of our Quarterly is designated No. 3, Volume LXVI; Fourth Series, XXXVI. This series is made up of "The Methodist Magazine," (monthly,) 1818 to 1829, inclusive—eleven volumes. The publication was then suspended for one year, and again revived as a Quarterly, and was so issued for eleven years under the direction of the editor of "The Christian Advocate," making the *Second Series.* In 1840 a separate editor (Rev. George Peck, D.D.) was elected, who was also to have the general editorship of the books published by the Book Concern, and the publication was by him raised to a higher plane, and designated as the beginning of a new (the third) series. In 1848 Dr. John M'Clintock was elected editor, and because some changes were made in the form, this, too, was designated as the beginning of a new series, (the fourth,) which was continued during the protracted editorship of Dr. Whedon.

There is certainly no exaggeration in the words of the compiler of this Index when he says, (in his preface,) "The files of 'The Methodist Quarterly Review' now contain the best thought of the Methodist Episcopal Church during nearly three quarters of a century." But on account of the miscellaneous character of the matter, and its wide distribution through so many volumes, it has been found only partially available for reference, so rendering an index indispensable to its further utility; and the title given above announces the preparation and publication of the much-needed guide to the hid treasures of these sixty-six volumes.

The author has evidently performed his work very largely as a labor of love, for only under such an incentive could such a performance be possible. After giving a brief "Historical Introduction," which will be at once new and very acceptable to the present generation of readers, the author presents his work under seven heads, each of which is, however, an index to all the several series—Biblical, Theological, Ecclesiastical, Philosophical, Biographical, Religious Intelligence, Miscellaneous. Then follows a list of the portraits (chiefly engravings on steel) that have appeared in the Review, and last of all three appendixes: (1) Names of authors, (writers for the periodical,) with indica-

tions of the pieces written, their places and dates. (2) Names of authors quoted, with like designations of places and dates; and (3) Names of authors whose works have been reviewed or noticed. In the principal indexes, every paper is distinctly named, and its contents indicated with such fullness as will enable the inquirer to form a pretty correct estimate of its scope and character.

Certainly the matter scattered through these more than sixty volumes is quite too valuable to be allowed to perish, and the volumes themselves to become practically worthless; which without some way to find out their contents must be the case, and against which such an index is the only available provision. It is well, therefore, that such a work has been prepared; and for it the Methodist public owe a debt of thanks to the compiler and the publishers.

For every one who possesses any considerable portion of these volumes, the Index will be a necessity and a sure assistance, and it will be scarcely less useful for those who have not the back volumes of the Review, as by its help they may readily ascertain what has been written on any subject, by whom, and in what manner treated. And to all such we can, in good faith, recommend this volume as amply meeting the demands of the case.

Heroes of Christian History. Richard Baxter. By G. D. Boyle, M.A., Dean of Salisbury. 12mo, pp. 170. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son.

The series of condensed biographies of eminent Christian leaders of the nearer and remote past in Great Britain, of which this sketch of the saintly Baxter is the seventh, will serve a valuable purpose for those who would know something of these worthies, and yet cannot avail themselves of larger and more elaborate works. They are decidedly well written.

The Revelation of the Father: Short Lectures on the Titles of the Lord in the Gospel of St. John. By Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D. 12mo, pp. 188. London and Cambridge: Macmilan and Co.

As the production of an eminent biblical and Christian scholar, written as public discourses, the chapters of this choice volume are specially adapted to personal Christian culture, and peculiarly so for those who read the Gospels in the expectation that Christ will reveal himself in his word.

The Macedonian Cry. A Voice from the Lands of Brahma and Buddha, Africa, and the Isles of the Sea, and a Plea for Missions. By Rev. John Lanthern. 12mo, pp. 280. Price, 70 cents. Toronto: William Briggs.

A valuable contribution to current missionary literature.

Studies in the Forty Days between Christ's Resurrection and Ascension. A Series of Essays for the Times. By A. A. LIPSCOMB, D.D., LL.D., Emeritus Professor, Vanderbilt University. Nashville, Tenn: Southern Methodist Publishing House. 1884.

The preparation of this little volume has evidently been a labor of love with its gifted writer. It is not destitute of earnest arguments for definite opinions touching its subject, but its methods of statement, its fine metaphysical seed-thoughts, and the fertility of its fancying are especially noteworthy. The vein of devout meditation that pervades it will also prove an especial attraction.

Light Ahead. By CECILIA A. GARDINER. 12mo, pp. 443. $1 25. New York: Phillips & Hunt.

A decidedly readable story, well written and vivacious, and of wholesome moral and religious tendencies.

The Gospel of the Secular Life. Sermons preached at Oxford, with a Prefatory Note. 18mo, pp. 256. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Excellent.

The Doom of the Majority of Mankind. By SAMUEL J. BURROWS. 18mo, pp. 154. American Unitarian Association.

A terrible indictment of the doctrine of election; but none of the difficulties of the other side of the problem are noticed.

A Golden Inheritance. By REESE ROCKWELL. 12mo, pp. 340. New York: Phillips & Hunt.

Well written; a good story, of excellent moral and religious tone.

Sound Bodies for Boys and Girls. By WILLIAM BLAIKIE, Author of "How to Get Strong and How to Stay So." 18mo, pp. 168. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Mothers in Council. 18mo, pp. 194. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Very readable, and eminently judicious.

Short History of the Reformation. By JOHN F. HURST, D.D. With Illustrations. 18mo, pp. 125. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Multum in parvo.

Letters to Cardinal M'Closkey, Archbishop of New York. By JAMES A. O'CONNER, of the Reformed Catholic Church. 16mo, pp. 190. Paper.

Outline Missionary Series. India: Country, People, Missions. By J. T. GRACEY. 12mo, pp. 207. Paper covers. Rochester: Scranton, Wetmore, & Co.

Martin Luther: A Study of the Reformation. By EDWIN D. MEAD. 12mo, pp. 194. Boston: George H. Ellis.

Unitarian Affirmations. Seven Discourses given in Washington, D. C. By Unitarian Ministers. 16mo, pp. 175. Boston: Unitarian Association.

Raising the Pearl. By JAMES OTIS, Author of "Toby Tyler," etc. 16mo, pp. 300. New York: Harper & Brothers.

More Leaves from the Journal of a Life in the Highlands, (Queen Victoria's,) from 1862 to 1882. With Portraits and Illustrations. 16mo, pp. 171. Paper covers. New York: Harper & Brothers.

A Presentation of the Grammar of New English. Beginning with the Age of Elizabeth. By GEORGE H. WEBSTER. 12mo, pp. 160. Pittsburg, Pa.

Agnosticism of Hume and Huxley. With a Notice of the Scottish School. By JAMES M'COSH, President of Princeton College. Philosophical Series, No. VI. 8vo, pp. 70. Paper covers. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Memoir of Charles Lowe. By his wife, MARTHA PERRY LOWE. 12mo, pp. 569. Boston: Cupples, Upham, & Co.

Manners and Social Usages. By MRS. JOHN SHERWOOD, Author of "A Transplanted Rose." 16mo, pp. 325. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Modern Physics: Studies, Historical and Philosophical. By ERNEST NAVILLE, Corresponding Member of the Institute of France. Translated from the French by HENRY BOYNTON, M.A. 12mo, pp. 324. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford.

The Creators of the Age of Steel. By W. T. JEANS. 12mo, pp. 349. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Mechanics' and Engineers' Pocket-Book of Tables, Rules, and Formulas, etc. (Forty-fifth Edition.) By CHARLES H. HASWELL. 18mo, pp. 922. Flexible leather, with Tucks. New York: Harper and Brothers.

The Mystery of Creation, and of Man; To which is Added a New View of Future Punishment. By L. C. BAKER. Second Edition, 18mo, pp. 229. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.

The Remarkable History of Sir Thomas Upmore, Bart., M.P., formerly Known as "Tommy Upmore." By R. D. BLACKMORE, Author of "Chipps the Carrier," etc. 18mo, pp. 255. New York: Harper & Brothers.

English Men of Letters. Edited by JOHN MORLEY. *Addison.* By W. J. CANTHORPE. 12mo, pp. 182. New York: Harper & Brothers.

HARPER'S FRANKLIN SQUARE LIBRARY: *The Man She Cared For.* By F. W. ROBINSON.—*The Way of the World.* A Novel. By D. CHRISTIE MURRAY.—*Chinese Gordon.* A Succinct Record of his Life. By ARCHIBALD FORBES. Illustrated.—*The Remarkable History of Sir Thomas Upmore, Bart., M.P.* Formerly known as "Tommy Upmore." By R. D. BLACKMORE.—*John Holdsworth, Chief Mate.* A Novel. By W. CLARK RUSSELL.—*In the West Countrie.* A Novel. By MAY CROMMELIN.—*A Fair Country Maid.* A Novel. By E. FAIRFAX BYRNE.—*Godfrey Helstone.* A Novel. By GEORGIANA M. CRAIK.

The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. The Text in the Authorized Translation: with a Commentary and Critical Notes: by ADAM CLARKE, LL.D., F.S.A., etc. A New Edition, Condensed and Supplemented from the Best Modern Authorities: by DANIEL CURRY, LL.D. Vol. II.: The Apostolical Epistles and Revelation. Imperial 8vo, pp. 640. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe.

Nearly four years ago the present editor of the Methodist Quarterly Review, at the request of the Book Agents at New York, undertook the revisal of Dr. Adam Clarke's "Commentary on the New Testament," according to the plan indicated in the title given above. The work grew upon his hands much beyond his original expectation, and with bringing it through the press it has continued to the present time—though the first volume was published more than a year since. But at length all is completed, and the publication of the concluding volume is about to be announced. To give our readers the information they may desire respecting the design of the work, agreeable to which it had been executed, we insert the "Editor's Preface" to the second volume:

"The Preface to the first volume of the Revised Edition of Clarke's Commentary on the New Testament set forth with sufficient fullness the principles which had been adopted respecting the whole work. But the rules there indicated, as those according to which the revision of that volume had been made, have, from the necessities of the case, led to more considerable emendations and additions than seemed to be necessary in the former portion of the work. But in respect to the editor's sympathies with the views and opinions of his author, all that is there said may be here repeated and emphasized; and the fidelity to the general doctrinal opinions of the original work has been honestly adhered to, not simply as a yoke, but gladly, as felicitously indicating the mind of the Spirit as revealed in the written word. But in bringing the work of expounding and illustrating the apostolical writings up to the higher plane on which biblical learning now stands, as compared with its position fifty years ago, very considerable modifications have seemed to be necessary, and wherever that has appeared they have been made. All these, however, it is believed, have been made along the lines of the development of truth which the original work clearly marked out and pursued to a greater extent than had been done at that date by any other writer using the English language; for, as a biblical scholar and exegete, Dr. Clarke was at least a quarter of a century—perhaps twice that time—in advance of the learning of his age. But the regions in which he was a pioneer have since been

thoroughly explored, and the results, constituting a rich store of scriptural learning, duly appropriated. The reviser has sought to build the results thus obtained into the structure of evangelical and rational biblical theology, whose foundations he found so admirably made to his hands in the original. He therefore flatters himself that the now completed work of New Testament revision, while necessarily supplementary to the original, is in no important particular out of harmony with its spirit and purport; and that whatever has been added is substantially of the same character with the primitive stock. To pervert an author's meanings, while still utilizing his name and reputation, would savor of dishonesty; while to reproduce error or suppress truth would indicate a lack of prudence at once dishonorable and unjust.

"The authorities drawn upon (in the work) will be seen to be representative of the best and most scholarly Christian and biblical learning of the age, and at the same time free from any taint of the learned skepticism and the anarchical liberalism of a well-known school of rationalistic biblical critics and expositors. It has been the design in every case to evade no difficult passage, to recognize all really obscure points, and to give the chief renderings of them by the best and most trustworthy critics and expositors; and when all these fail to give satisfactory solutions of the cases in hand, to honestly confess that the subject remains unexplained. Cases in point will be found in the matter of 'tongues,' (1 Cor. xii, 10; xiv, 2, etc.,) and in the reasons rendered for the veiling of women in the public assemblies, 'because of the angels,' of which, with some others, no expositor has given any satisfactory solution: and this is freely confessed. In other cases, in which it is evident that a false exegesis (which in some things has widely prevailed in past times) has engendered popular misconceptions of the sense of Holy Scripture, it has been thought best simply to give the true expositions without polemical discussions, and so permit the truth to work the needed corrections. Considering the word of God—and eminently the apostolical epistles—as a mine of untold richness as yet only partially developed, it has been a ruling purpose to detect and bring to light some of these hidden stores; and where the gems of spiritual truth come to us in sensuous and materialistic coverings, the design has been to bring them to the light and to show their value.

"Special attention has been devoted to the Prefaces and In-

troductions to the several epistles. It was necessary that these should be brief and concise, and it was also desirable that they should present the literary history and the occasion of the writing of each epistle; especially as these things tend to throw light upon the text. The results rather than the processes of inquiry are given; and as far as possible the time and place of the writing of each epistle, the people addressed, and the special occasion that called it forth, are considered. In these brief documents a large amount of valuable learning is given in a concise but comprehensive form, derived from the best sources; and while the information they give is necessary to the proper understanding of the several epistles, it is believed that for all non-professional students of the Bible they will prove sufficient helps in the matters of which they treat. For all others, distinct works, treatises, or manuals are required.

"In closing a work to which a large share of his time, for more than three and a half years, has been devoted, the editor would render devout thanks for the good Providence that has blessed him with health and strength for his work and enabled him to bring it to completion. The intimate mental and spiritual relations into which it has brought him to the divine word and its great Author have at once confirmed his faith and enlarged his appreciation of the inestimable value of the Holy Scriptures, and assured him, by a blessed experience, that Christ reveals himself to those who seek for him in the written word."

D. C.

METHODIST
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1884.

ART. I. — THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH.

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

IN the preceding number of this Quarterly we gave a brief history of the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch, and at the conclusion (p. 419) indicated, as results of that criticism which ought in all fairness to be conceded, (1) that the Pentateuch contains some passages which were not written by Moses; (2) that it contains documents of various dates and authorship; (3) that many of its laws were unknown or neglected during the period between the conquest of Canaan and the Babylonian captivity; and (4) that the last four books exhibit different stages and forms of legislation. Let us now inquire if these four propositions are inconsistent with the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch.

I. PASSAGES NOT WRITTEN BY MOSES.

Our space will not allow a full discussion of all the passages in the Pentateuch which have been thought to be inconsistent with Mosaic authorship; nor need we, for our purpose, more than mention some of the more prominent examples. Those most frequently cited are Gen. xii, 6; xiii, 7, where the observation is made that "the Canaanite was then in the land:" the mention of Dan in Gen. xiv, 14, and Deut. xxxiv, 1, a name not given to the place until the times of the Judges, (Judg.

xviii, 29:) Gen. xxxvi, 31, where a list of Edomite kings is given who reigned "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel." Exod. xvi, 35, contains a statement which seems inappropriate at that place, breaks the otherwise natural connection of verses 34 and 36, and may not unreasonably be believed to be an interpolation. The laudatory remark touching Moses in Num. xii, 3, is hardly such as a meek man would write about himself, and no one believes that Moses wrote the account of his own death in Deut. xxxiv. The words in Deut. ii, 12, have been thought to point to a time when Israel had taken possession of the promised land, and the whole context, verses 10–12, and also verses 20–23 of the same chapter, and verses 9–11 of chap. iii, may easily have been an editorial addition. So, too, the words, "Unto this day," in Deut. iii, 14, most naturally imply a time subsequent to the days of Moses.

Some of the above passages, we doubt not, may be legitimately explained so as to harmonize with the idea that Moses wrote them. Thus the statements made in Gen. xii, 6, and xiii, 7, do not necessarily imply that the Canaanite was not in the land at the time of the writer, for his purpose may have been to show that Abram was not the first dweller in that land; the Canaanites and the Perizzites had already settled there. So, too, Deut. ii, 12, is most accurately translated: "Even as Israel has done to the land of his possession, which Jehovah has given to them;" and this might well have been written by Moses after the Israelites had taken possession of the land east of the Jordan. But granting that all these, and probably other passages also, are of later date than the time of Moses, what must be our conclusion? Two methods of accounting for such facts at once suggest themselves: (1) The books of which these passages form a part were not composed until sometime after the Mosaic age, or (2) these passages are additions made by a later hand. Either of these suppositions is sufficient to account for the facts; but these facts alone are not sufficient to determine the date or authorship of the Pentateuch, taken as a whole. If we have other reasons sufficient to convince us that these books are in substance the work of Moses, or originated in his day, the class of passages cited above present no considerable difficulty, for it is perfectly reasonable that such additions may have been inserted by the hands of editors and transcribers.

"This might be a fair enough thing to say," observes W. R. Smith, ("Old Testament in Jewish Church," p. 322,) "if any positive proof were forthcoming that Moses wrote the mass of the Pentateuch." But this way of meeting our argument is an adroit attempt, characteristic of this school of critics, to throw the burden of *proving* the Mosaic authorship on those who see no sufficient reason to reject the ancient and uniform tradition. This may fairly be pronounced a specious movement to shift responsibility. The burden of proof is manifestly on the side of those who deny the Mosaic authorship. An ancient and uncontradicted belief of centuries is entitled to the first consideration, and should not be rejected until valid evidence of its falsity has been produced. Especially is the principle to be insisted on in the case of a tradition so well grounded as this one. The last four books of the Pentateuch claim over and over again, in the plainest and most positive manner, to be a record of what the Lord communicated to Moses and commanded him to set before the Israelitish people. The three middle books are filled with details of what "Jehovah spake unto Moses." We find no law or statement thus introduced which contains any thing inconsistent with such claims. No character in the Old Testament has such a unique grandeur as Moses, and there is none besides to whom such a body of laws can be so fittingly attributed. The subsequent history of Israel contains numerous incidental allusions to laws, customs, and institutions of which the Pentateuch makes him, under God, the author. The prophets and psalms abound in references to the exodus and the ministry of Moses in such ways as to recognize that period as the greatest epoch of the national history. Finally, our Lord himself accepted this tradition, and expressed himself in language which cannot be naturally explained without admitting that he corroborated the common belief of his nation. John v, 46, 47; vii, 19, 22. Such a tradition and belief must, according to all legitimate principles of criticism, be accepted as *prima facie* evidence of the Mosaic authorship. It may not be positive or conclusive *proof* of such authorship, but it has the first right to stand until proof of its incorrectness is forthcoming. Where is the unbiassed student, or where the candid critic, who will not concede that such a line of evidence is less easily set aside than the occurrence of occasional

passages which may be easily and legitimately explained as subsequent additions?

It has been claimed that the expression, "Beyond the Jordan," in such passages as Deut. i, 1, 5, (wrongly translated "On this side Jordan,") and the words used for "southward" and "westward," (Heb. נֶגְבָּה, *toward the Negeb*, and יָמָּה, *toward the sea*, Exod. xxvi, 18, 22,) in describing the sides of the tabernacle, prove that the writer lived in Western Palestine. For, to Moses in Moab, "beyond the Jordan" could only mean west of the Jordan, and at Sinai the sea was not westward, and the Negeb was to the north. But this argument ignores the fact that the Hebrew language was formed in Palestine, and such words and phrases had become fixed in common usage as far back as the time of Abram. Gen. xiii, 14. They would accordingly be used by a Hebrew, whether writing in Egypt, Arabia, or Babylon. It was as appropriate for Moses, in the Sinaitic peninsula, to speak of the Negeb and seaward sides of the tabernacle as it was for Daniel and Ezekiel to use these words by the rivers of Babylon. Dan. viii, 4, 9; xi, 5, 29; Ezek. xlviii, 10, 16.

II. Documents Incorporated in the Pentateuch.

That the Pentateuch contains ancient documents of various dates and authorship is readily conceded. The wonder is that any one should ever have disputed this proposition, especially in regard to Genesis. This ancient narrative recounts events which are alleged by the writer himself to have occurred centuries and millenniums before Moses's day. The only rational supposition is that written documents and oral traditions were employed in its composition, and this hypothesis holds equally well, whether we attribute the work to Moses or to some other writer. But sober students will be slow to commend, much less to follow, the attempts of critics to detect and dissect the particular sources, and determine the work of each writer even to the divisions of single verses! This microscopic refinement of criticism will be likely to refute itself. There is not an ancient work extant which, if subjected to such a process, could not be shown to have come from a variety of authors; and not a few learned treatises of modern times might be greatly improved, in the judgment of wearied readers, if only shorn of

much that exact criticism might justly pronounce redundant, obscure, or slovenly.

A great deal has been said about the substantial agreement of critics concerning the ancient sources, and Prof. Ladd exhibits, in eight pages of his recent work,* the comparative harmony of Knobel, Schrader, Dillmann, and Wellhausen, in their analysis of the Hexateuch. But those same tables also serve admirably to show, by their numerous minute variations, the purely subjective principles of this species of criticism. There need be little, if any, dispute about the facts detailed; the controversy must turn upon the use made of the facts. Let it be assumed that the use of Elohim, or Jehovah, or some other divine name, must always indicate diverse authorship; let it be admitted that all differences of style and redundancy and repetition are proof of so many different "sources," and the work of analytical criticism is very simple. The harmony of critics adopting these principles is very much of the nature of a mechanical necessity. It scarcely needs the learning of a Knobel or a Dillmann to perform such labor. An ordinary school-boy, with a few pedagogical directions, might go through the Bible and pick out and classify such distinctions as Elohistic and Jehovistic chapters and verses. Repetitions and marked differences of style are recognized by every careful reader; and few, if any, will dispute that many of these differences, and the peculiar use of the names Elohim and Jehovah in some parts of Genesis, are most naturally explained by the hypothesis of different documents appropriated by the author of the book, and by him wrought over into one continuous narrative. The real question of criticism, we repeat, is not about the facts, but about theories assuming to rest upon these facts. The critics of one school affirm the existence of an original Elohistic document, running through the entire Hexateuch, and they are positive that the Jehovistic and other portions are later supplements. But the most recent school has changed to the very reverse of this, and conclude that the Elohist was the final redactor of the whole. Why should we follow either of these schools? Why may not Moses himself have gathered up the different traditions and documents, and compiled the Book of Genesis, and, in the course of forty

* "The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture," vol. i, pp. 517-525. New York, 1883.

years, have added the other books, which from time immemorial have been ascribed to him? Later editors have added here and there a sentence, and Eleazar or Joshua (comp. Josh. xiv, 1; xxiv, 26) might very appropriately have appended the account of the great lawgiver's death, and, indeed, have compiled the whole of Deuteronomy, using in the main the last sayings of Moses; but such admissions furnish no valid argument against the Mosaic authorship of the great body of the work.

III. Ignorance and Neglect of the Law after the Age of Moses.

It appears from the extant records of Israelitish history that the laws of the Pentateuch were either unknown or else very generally neglected and violated during most of the period between the conquest of Canaan and the Babylonian exile. In proof of this we may cite the story of Micah and the Levite, (Judg. xvii, xviii,) the sacrilege of Eli's sons, (1 Sam. ii,) the offering of Jephthah's daughter as a human sacrifice, (Judg. xi,) the rash vows and illegal acts of Saul, and the wide-spread habit of worship at high places, the idolatry of Solomon, the calf-worship at Bethel and Dan, the Baal worship under Ahab and his heathen wife, and the multiplied idolatries of later kings. Facts of this character may be adduced in abundance, and critics of the school of Kuenen and Wellhausen appeal to them as evidence that the Mosaic laws and ritual were at the time unknown. Amos's mention of "the high places of Isaac" and the "sanctuaries of Israel" (chap. vii, 9) is cited to show that worship at high places was the ancient and hereditary practice of the nation, against which they knew no law. The facts cited certainly show either great ignorance or great neglect and violation of the laws of Moses; but do they warrant the inference that those laws were not then in existence? We answer, No; and for the following reasons:

1. Neglect, violation, or ignorance of sacred laws is no proof of their non-existence. According to Hosea iv, 2, swearing, falsehood, theft, adultery, and murder abounded in his day; but is this any evidence that the commandments of the decalogue prohibiting those crimes were then non-existent or unknown? Saul's fell purpose to murder David might be as fairly cited to prove that no law against homicide was then

extant. The whole drift and implication of the history of those times show that it was a period of violence and neglect of God's laws. How far those laws were known we cannot now determine; but there is much reason to suppose that, from Joshua to Josiah, the great mass of the Israelites knew very little of the sacred books of their nation. Almost universal ignorance of the Holy Scriptures prevailed in Europe for more than six hundred years before the Lutheran Reformation; more easily, we believe, might a similar ignorance of the Book of the Law have prevailed for as many centuries in Israel before the reign of Josiah.

2. We have no need to assume that even great prophets, like Samuel and Elijah, must have been familiar with the Books of Moses. They may have known much of the sacred laws and customs, as such, without any particular acquaintance with the books in which they were written. Neither they nor the later prophets were representatives of the sanctuary or ritual, but they were sent forth with the fresh, living oracle of God, which every-where extols the spirit rather than the letter. The key-note of Old Testament prophetism was sounded by Samuel himself, who, though reared at the house of Jehovah in Shiloh, (1 Sam. i, 9, 24; iii, 3,) and after its desolation offering burnt-offerings at other places, (1 Sam. vii, 9, 10,) said to Saul: "Hath Jehovah as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of Jehovah? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." 1 Sam. xv, 22. But how much Samuel, or Elijah, or Amos, or Hosea knew, or did not know, about the written laws, or any literary documents of their nation, must be matter of conjecture, and cannot be made the basis of an argument. The import and value of any allusion they make must be determined by valid exegesis; but it always awakens suspicion to find a modern writer assuming to say what Elijah or Amos *did not know*, and then proceeding to rest an argument or build a theory upon such supposed ignorance. Suppose Elijah had never seen or read or heard of the books of Moses, does it follow that no such books existed? According to 1 Kings xix, 10, he did not know that there were seven thousand in Israel who refused to worship Baal. Hundreds of our most excellent citizens have never read the Constitution of the United States,

and an immense portion of our national literature reveals no hint of its existence. Multitudes among us who have been made familiar from childhood with the great names and facts of sacred history never read any considerable portion of the Bible, and some such often betray lamentable ignorance. A United States Senator is reported as saying: "He trembled like Belshazzar when Paul said to him, Thou art the man!" There might have been seven thousand copies of the Pentateuch in existence at Elijah's time, and all of them unknown to him, and out of the way of the most conspicuous persons of that period.

3. There is evidence, however, in the historical books, the Prophets and the Psalms, to indicate the priority of the legislation recorded in the Pentateuch. We meet with numerous allusions which are best explained by accepting the traditional belief of the antiquity of the books of Moses. The tabernacle and central place of worship was at first established at Shiloh. Josh. xviii, 1, 10; xix, 51. This fact is again recognized in Judg. xviii, 31. In 1 Sam. i, 3, 9, 24, the house of God is still at Shiloh, and thither all Israel bring their offerings, (ii, 22, 29.) The ministering priests are descendants of Aaron, (ii, 27, 28.) The ark is known as "the ark of the covenant of Jehovah," (iv, 3; comp. Exod. xxv, 21; Num. x, 33; xiv, 44,) but when captured by the Philistines, and while separated from the tabernacle, the glory departed from Israel. 1 Sam. iv, 21, 22; vii, 2. This fact largely explains the irregularities of worship and the demoralization that prevailed thereafter. Comp. 1 Kings iii, 2. The tabernacle with its priestly service was removed to Nob, (1 Sam. xxi, 1–7,) and afterward to Gibeon. 1 Kings iii, 4; 1 Chron. xvi, 39. David brought the ark to Jerusalem, and instituted a provisional worship there, (2 Sam. vi,) and under Solomon the temple became the great national sanctuary, which all Israel recognized as the place where Jehovah recorded his name. 1 Kings viii, 29; comp. Deut. xii, 11. The prominence of the priests and the ark at the dedication, and the numerous allusions, in 1 Kings viii, to the Exodus, the ministry of Moses, and the language of our present Pentateuch, imply the previous existence both of the Levitical and the Deuteronomic code. The disruption of the kingdom under Rehoboam, and Jeroboam's shrewd policy of

turning the national heart away from Jerusalem, (1 Kings xii,) abundantly explain the disorder and idolatry that followed. In the light of this history, the notion that the worship at Bethel and Dan and other local sanctuaries represents the ancient ante-Mosaic cultus, against which there was as yet no law, appears in the highest degree absurd. The prophets thenceforward address the nation as rebellious and backslidden children. Hosea proclaims that Israel has apostatized from Jehovah, until the many precepts of his written law have become a strange thing. Hos. viii, 12. Amos declares that Judah also has despised the law of Jehovah, and has not kept his commandments. Amos ii, 4. Isaiah complains that the entire nation had become utterly corrupt. Isa. i, 4–6. The older Psalms recognize Zion as the holy hill, (Psa. ii, 6; iii, 4,) Jehovah dwelling in his holy temple, (xi, 4,) and the duty of observing his statutes, (xviii, 22.) These and other similar facts imply the previous existence of the substance of the Mosaic history and legislation, and utterly nullify all *e silentio* arguments against the traditional opinion of the Mosaic books.

IV. Relation of the Levitical and Deuteronomic Codes.

Until the rise of the new critical school, represented by Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen, Deuteronomy was believed to be of later origin than the other books of the Pentateuch. The contrary theory, propounded in 1835 by Von Böhlen, Vatke, and George, obtained little currency, and such German critics as Schrader and Dillmann still maintain that Deuteronomy is the later work. But the critics of both these schools agree that the Book of Deuteronomy originated in the latter period of the Jewish monarchy, and its main portions constituted "the Book of the Law" which was discovered by Hilkiah. Three questions accordingly present themselves for our consideration: 1. What evidence exists to show that the book discovered by Hilkiah consisted solely of Deuteronomy? 2. Where is the proof that Deuteronomy, or any considerable portion of it, was first written in the times of Manasseh or Josiah? 3. What is the real relation of Deuteronomy to the three middle books of the Pentateuch?

1. What evidence exists to show that the book discovered by Hilkiah consisted of Deuteronomy only? It is called "the

Book of the Law," and "the Book of the Covenant." 2 Kings xxii, 8, 11; xxiii, 2, 21; comp. 2 Chron. xxxiv, 14, 15, 30: xxxv, 12. The reforms instituted by Josiah were warranted by laws found in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, as well as in Deuteronomy. Did the king destroy idolatrous images? This was enjoined in Exod. xxiii, 24, 33; xxxiv, 12–17, and Num. xxxiii, 51, 52. Did he put down the cruel worship of Molech? The only places in the Pentateuch where this god is mentioned by name are Lev. xviii, 21, and xx, 2–5. Did he abolish witchcraft? That also is condemned in the law of Leviticus, (xix, 31; xx, 27.) And the law of the Passover appears in Exodus, (xii; xxiii, 15; xxxiv, 18.) Leviticus, (xxiii, 5–8,) and Numbers, (ix, 2, 3.) Why then assume that Josiah's "law-book" consisted solely of Deuteronomy? That it contained Deuteronomy is not disputed, but when we are told that there is no evidence that Josiah had any thing more than Deut. xii–xxvi on which to base his reforms, it is ample and complete reply to say that there is also no evidence that this "Deuteronomic Code" was all his book contained. The plea that he did not observe some commandments which are found in other parts of the Pentateuch is nullified by the fact that he did not, so far as appears from the history, observe numerous things which are enjoined in Deuteronomy. There exists, therefore, no valid evidence that the Book of the Law or Book of the Covenant mentioned in 2 Kings xxii, 8, and xxiii, 2, contained Deuteronomy only.*

2. What evidence exists to show that the Book of Deuteronomy was first written at or near the time of Josiah's reign?

It is alleged that the style of composition is notably different from that of the other books of the Pentateuch. This is admitted by all, but is sufficiently accounted for by the nature of its subject-matter. It professes to be in substance a series of discourses delivered by Moses at the conclusion of his long life and ministry. Years probably intervened between the composition of these discourses and most of his other writings, and the time, the occasion, and the purpose of Deuteronomy, ac-

* "Of the finding of a book there is no doubt; and the arguments, such as they are, which prove, or are thought to prove, that it was Deuteronomy, a part of the five books, are equally valid to prove that it was the whole of the five books."—"Deuteronomy the People's Book," p. 16. London, 1877. See also pp. 18–23.

cording to the traditional belief, would warrant the expectation of finding in such a repetition of history and laws a different style from that of previous books. "The fervor and warmth," says Eichhorn, "which breathe in every line, make it apparent that countless emotions in the soul of the great man crowded themselves into his writing, and set on every page the seal of a work composed on the verge of the grave." * As for the character of the Hebrew employed in Deuteronomy, Kleinert has adduced controlling evidence to show that it savors of an older time than the later period of the Jewish monarchy. He shows by the citation of numerous examples that it resembles the previous Books of Moses more than it does the Books of Jeremiah and Kings. †

It is argued that the new order of things introduced by Josiah, and based upon this book, is evidence that the book itself could not have been in existence before. This argument, however, rests upon the assumption, already shown to be unsound, that national ignorance and non-observance of laws are proof of their non-existence. But, on the other hand, if Deuteronomy, or any considerable portion of "the law of Moses," originated in the days of Josiah, and was first made public as narrated in 2 Kings xxii, it was manifestly a forgery. The more radical critics do not hesitate to acknowledge this, and treat it as a pious fraud. Others endeavor to explain it as a literary fiction or a legal fiction, not intended to deceive, but merely to put in practical shape the doctrines of the prophets. But the subject-matter and historical position of the work are incompatible with any such hypothesis. We cannot conceive how a code of laws, originating under such circumstances, could have become the basis and rule of a national religion so pure and lofty. A writer of Josiah's time might, indeed, have published a book in the name of Moses. Poems, proverbs, philosophical disquisitions, and prophetical books have often been put forth under assumed names. Perhaps the Book of Ecclesiastes is a work of this kind, put forth, for obvious reasons, in the name of Solomon. We have numerous apocryphal and pseudepigraphal works of this character. But such books never had any notable influence on the national government

* "Einleitung in das A. T.," vol. ii, p. 405. Leipzig, 1803.

† "Das Deuteronomium und der Deuteronomiker," p. 235. Leipzig, 1872.

and worship. Such a production, which every body knew to be a fiction, could have had no authority to warrant the innovations undertaken by Josiah. Why should a book written in the reign of Manasseh or Josiah contain commandments to exterminate Canaanites and Amalekites, (Deut. xx, 16–18; xxv, 17–19,) tribes which were not then in existence? Was it done to give the work the tone of an ancient writing? Such a supposition would only make the fraudulent character of the book more glaring. It is for us easier a thousand times to believe the traditional authorship of the Pentateuch than to accept the hypothesis of such a forgery and fraud, in which Hilkiah, the priest, and Huldah, the prophetess, joined together to deceive the king and the whole Jewish nation, and succeeded so completely as to make a fictitious book the legal and constitutional basis of the national religion. Nay, this surreptitious introduction of the Book of the Law was so deftly done that it raised no suspicion or outcry at the time, and for more than two thousand years has been stupidly supposed to be a genuine work of Moses!

3. But what is the real relation of Deuteronomy to the three middle books of the Pentateuch? It is claimed by the Wellhausen school that there are three different codes or groups of laws traceable in the books of Moses, of which the most ancient is the Book of the Covenant, embracing Exodus xx–xxiii, adapted to an early period of the national life, and recognizing a plurality of altars or local sanctuaries. Next in order is the Deuteronomic Code, which aimed to abolish the local sanctuaries and centralize the national worship at Jerusalem. The Levitical legislation followed at a later date, was first planned during the exile, and appears in outline in Ezekiel's writings, but was worked over and incorporated in the three middle books of our Pentateuch by Ezra, or one of his contemporaries. Deuteronomy, accordingly, becomes the oldest book of the Pentateuch, and the other books, in their principal contents and present form, are post-exilian.

That different stages of legislation are traceable in the Pentateuch, and that the Book of Leviticus contains a more elaborate priestly code than appears in Deuteronomy may be readily admitted. Our present concern is to know whether these codes are inconsistent with each other, or of such a nature that

they might not all have originated in the times of Moses. The main arguments against the traditional belief rest upon an alleged inconsistency in the different codes touching (1) places of sacrificial worship, (2) the offerings required, (3) the number of feasts, and (4) the distinction between priests and Levites.

1. *Places of Sacrificial Worship.* In Exod. xx, 24, provision is made for building an altar "in all places (בְּכָל־הַמָּקוֹם) where I record my name," but according to Deut. xii, 5, *ff.*, all the offerings of Israel must be presented at a central sanctuary, "which Jehovah your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there." The Levitical legislation recognizes a central altar, (Exod. xxix, 18, 38; Lev. i, 3, 5; iv, 4; vi, 14,) but its provisions are applicable both to the tabernacle in the wilderness, or to the temple at Jerusalem.

There is no inconsistency between these different legal regulations. The first legislation, made at Sinai, provides for an unsettled people, contemplates future journeyings, and the probable need of successive altars at different places. It does not allow the erection of altars on every high hill, or wherever the people or their leaders choose to place them, but only at such places as Jehovah should designate. This is perfectly compatible with the Deuteronomic order for a central sanctuary, made nearly forty years later, when Israel was about to enter the land of promise. The Deuteronomic law itself explains that this regulation would be in place only after Jehovah had given them full possession of the land. Deut. xii, 9–11. Moreover, there is nothing in Deuteronomy inconsistent with the supposition that, after the central sanctuary had been divinely chosen, Jehovah himself might, under exceptional circumstances, authorize sacrifice in other places. The critics urge that the sacrifices at Bochim (Judg. ii, 5) and at Ophrah, (Judg. vi, 26,) the offerings of Manoah (Judg. xiii, 19, 20) and Samuel (1 Sam. vii, 9, 17) and David, (2 Sam. xxiv, 25,) and the prevalence of local sanctuaries of later times, are evi dence that the Deuteronomic law was unknown to the holiest men of Israel. But the history shows that these exceptional altars were authorized by special theophanies, or justified by peculiar circumstances. Those occurring under the ministry of Samuel are explained by the fact that the sanctuary at Shiloh

was then desolate, and Jehovah had forsaken the place where he first recorded his name. Psa. lxviii, 60, 68; Jer. vii, 12, 14. All other worship at high places was idolatrous, and, in part, a natural result of the demoralized state of the nation, when there were numerous violations of the Mosaic laws, and great ignorance and superstition prevailed among the people.*

2. *The Offerings Required.* Exod. xx, 24, mentions only burnt-offerings and peace-offerings; Deut. xii, 6, 11, speaks of burntt-offerings, heave-offerings, free-will offerings, tithes, and vows; Leviticus provides for all these, and also for the meat-offerings, (ii,1,) and the sin and trespass offerings. Chaps. iv, v. Peace-offerings are not mentioned in Deuteronomy, except incidentally at chap. xxvii, 7, and the meat-offerings not at all. Leviticus enjoins a great number and variety of ceremonies and purifications, which are held to indicate a later period, when the priesthood had control of the nation and instituted an elaborate ritual. But every careful reader must see that the differences here pointed out are in no sense contradictory. There is nothing connected with any of these offerings that is inconsistent with a Mosaic origin. The hortatory style and purpose of Deuteronomy did not require a minute repetition of all the details of ritual which were elsewhere sufficiently recorded; and will any one contend that, when one book does not specify all the items of another bearing on the same subject, its author must have been ignorant of such omitted items? Is no other explanation possible? Surely, a theory based upon such variations as these will not be likely to command the confidence of a logical mind.

3. *The Number of Sacred Feasts.* The same kind of disparity is urged respecting the Feasts. Exodus (xxiii, 10–17)

* Prof. W. H. Green goes through the whole list of so-called "local sanctuaries," and very clearly shows "that, apart from idolatrous perversions, there was not a single sanctuary for permanent worship among them. Deduct the two or three instances, in the period of the Judges, in which Jehovah or the Angel of Jehovah appeared to men, and sacrifices were offered on the spot; deduct further the sacrifices offered when Israel had no sanctuary, after God had withdrawn from Shiloh and before the temple was built, or in the peculiar circumstances of the Ten Tribes in the life-time of Elijah—deduct these sacrifices which were due to special causes and were strictly limited to the occasion that called them forth, and there is not a particle of evidence that any one of these places was a sanctuary for the worship of Jehovah." "Moses and the Prophets," pp. 167. New York, 1882.

specifies the three feasts of unleavened bread, harvest, and ingatherings, and the observance of the seventh day and the seventh year. Deuteronomy (xv, xvi) mentions all these, except the Sabbath law, (which, however, is mentioned in chap. v, 12–15,) and the feasts of harvest and ingatherings are here called the feast of weeks and the feast of tabernacles. Leviticus mentions all these, together with the feasts of Pentecost, (xxiii, 15–21,) and of trumpets, (xxiii, 24,) and the day of atonement, (xvi,) and the year of jubilee, (xxv, 8–13.) These are simply facts of the record, but how any one can derive from them a valid argument against the Mosaic origin of any or all the accounts is more than we are yet able to comprehend. That one code, or, as we may better say, one section of the great law-book of Israel, should contain a fuller and more minute description of details than another, is certainly no strange thing. The ingenuity of a theory which traces in these various sections different and successive stages of legislation may be admired; its validity as an argument against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is not commendable.

4. *The Priests and the Levites.* It is claimed that the first legislation (Exod. xx–xxiii) knows no special order of priests or an Aaronic priesthood; in Deuteronomy there is yet no distinction between priests and Levites, the constantly recurring expression being "the priests, the Levites," or "the priests, the sons of Levi;" but in Leviticus (viii–x) the sons of Aaron are formally set apart to the special work of the priesthood, and the other Levites appear as subordinate ministers. Here again are simple facts as recorded, but they do not warrant the conclusions which the new school critics presume to draw from them. There was no occasion in Exod. xx–xxiii to refer to the distinction named, for Aaron and his sons had not yet been set apart. According to the history itself their separate consecration followed much other legislation. Then, further, there was no occasion or necessity for Moses, in the circumstances under which Deuteronomy claims to have been issued, to recapitulate the details of priestly office and ritual, or do more than make such general references to the ministers of the sanctuary. The language employed in Deuteronomy assumes Israel's knowledge of numerous laws already established, and if we adopt the view, which the book itself abundantly warrants, that Deuteronomy

is especially "the people's book"—a more simple, practical, and hortatory repetition of the principal facts and laws of the Mosaic legislation—the mention of details of priestly office and ritual would have been manifestly out of place. What avails it to repeat over and over: "Deuteronomy knows no Levites who cannot be priests, and no priests who are not Levites."* Why not candidly face the question: Why should Moses, under the circumstances assumed in Deuteronomy, be expected to do more than allude as he does to the whole tribe of Levi as the chosen ministers of religion? He does NOT say that any Levite may be a priest. This is a notion foisted in by the critic. Why, moreover, should the school of Graf and Wellhausen try to force the proposition that from the Exodus to the Exile there was no high-priest as distinguished from ordinary priests and Levites? To affirm this in the face of the express mention of "Eleazar, the priest," (Josh. xix, 51; xxi, 2,) and "Eli, the priest," (1 Sam. i, 9; comp. ii, 27, 28,) and "the great priest" in the reign of Joash, (2 Kings xii, 10,) and of Josiah, (2 Kings xxii, 4, 8; xxiii, 4,) and of "the head priest" in the reign of Zedekiah, (2 Kings xxv, 18,) looks very much like a desperate purpose to carry out a theory at all hazards.†

What, now, may we conclude as to the relation of Deuteronomy to the three middle books of the Pentateuch? We find no evidence of the priority of Deuteronomy. We find nothing to warrant the opinion that any one of the first four books, or any considerable portion of any one of them, was composed after the death of the great lawgiver. The different legislation recorded in the several books was probably enacted at different times during the forty years of Moses's ministry, but we have no means of determining the particular date or occasion of each section of the Torah. Whatever the particular dates and sources of the various documents and laws, no sufficient reason has yet been given why the Pentateuch might not have received substantially its present form under the immediate supervision of Moses.

* Smith, "Old Testament in Jewish Church," p. 360.

† "What shall we say of a development which in the time from Moses (1320 B. C.) to Josiah (625 B. C.) only gets as far as Levitical priests, and in a single generation can develop the Aaronic priesthood and the high-priest with all his glory?" Curtiss, "The Levitical Priests," p. 163. Edinburgh, 1877.

It would be easy to add to the foregoing discussion the positive argument in favor of the Mosaic authorship, but our space forbids, and our purpose has been to show the inconclusiveness of the negative criticism. We only add in conclusion six reasons for rejecting the theories of the most recent school of the higher criticism.

1. Most of these critics enter upon the study of the Bible under a prejudice hostile to any supposable manifestation of the Supernatural in human history. Many of them confess this at the outset. With such writers all miracles are myths or legends, and he is the ablest critic who devises the most plausible theory of their origin.

2. A dispassionate study of the works of these critics begets a conviction that the detailed arguments, by which they endeavor to support their theories, are not the real steps of the process by which their conclusions were reached. The entire history of critical assaults upon the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch has been notably a succession of adjustments. One theory has given place to another, and the methods by which they have been put forward and urged are largely of the nature of special pleading to maintain a position already definitely taken.

3. The critical methods of Reuss, Kuenen, and their school are not so much based on a candid examination of all the contents of the sacred books of Israel as they are deduced from the application of a speculative philosophy of human history to these books, and an ingenious attempt to make the philosophy account for the history. Reuss tells us in the Preface of his work that his point of view is not that of the biblical history, but of the legal codes, and, beginning with an intuition, he has aimed and hoped "to find the Ariadne thread which would lead out of the labyrinth of current hypotheses of the origin of the Mosaic and other Old Testament books into the light of a psychologically intelligible course of development for the Israelitish people." * This is reversing the true logical method, which should rather formulate a philosophy of history upon an induction of facts, and not first construct the philosophy and then force the history into accord with it.

4. The arbitrary exegetical principles of these critics are not

* "Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des A. T.," p. 8.

of a nature to carry conviction to the minds of candid readers. Such an analysis of books and chapters as assumes with an air of dogmatic confidence to point out a variety of authors in a single paragraph, and to furnish a detailed account of all the sources from which a historian of two thousand years ago derived his knowledge, is too wonderful for us. It borders hard on the supernatural. It seems also at times to have positive acquaintance, not only with all the ancient author knew, but even with all that he did not know! Certainly, more use is often made of what the writer does not say than of what he does say.

5. The notion that Ezekiel's highly wrought vision of the temple and cultus was the outline of a priestly Torah to be observed by the exiles at their restoration to Jerusalem, is beset with insuperable difficulties. The language cannot without violence be interpreted literally. The details were never observed by the returning exiles, and the idea that Ezekiel's prophecy, issued in his own name, became the basis of an elaborate code of laws issued in the name of Moses is really too great a tax upon the credulity of earnest seekers after truth. Add to this the assumption that Ezra and Nehemiah, who wrote so much of their own work in their own name, were parties to this fictitious legislation! Why should critics make no difficulty of conceiving Ezekiel, more than forty years before the restoration, planning an imposing ritual for his nation, and yet imagine it impossible for Moses to do it less than forty years before the conquest of Canaan?

6. Finally, the assumption that an elaborate ritual and ranks of priesthood come in the natural order of development after the more spiritual word of prophecy may be boldly challenged. History shows the reverse to be true. Forms of worship, especially sacrifices and oblations, belong rather to undeveloped and imperfect periods of religious life. The Mosaic tabernacle with its elaborate cultus was admirably adapted to serve as an "object-lesson" to instruct Israel when a child. But a theory which makes the tabernacle a fiction, the priest-code an invention of Ezekiel, and the minute account of boards, and sockets, and bars, and hooks, and pillars, and curtains, and loops, and taches, and pots, and basins, and bowls, and spoons, and shovels, and plates, and pans, the conception of Jewish priests, at the

time of the exile, ought to tell us how such "bondage of the letter" fits in a theory of religious development. Is not the survival of the fittest a fundamental law of such development? But behold! the lofty lessons of Amos, Isaiah, and Micah, who, according to these critics, denounced sacrifices as a vain thing, without divine authority, and hateful to Jehovah, are superseded and overgrown by a ceremonial of outward service, concocted by designing priests, and foisted upon the chosen people in the name of Moses!

This species of criticism creates more difficulties than it solves. Its advocates may, perhaps, like Ewald, admire in portions of the Pentateuch the vestiges of an Elohistic writer so lofty as to deserve the title of the Great Unknown. We prefer to call him Moses, and identify him with that ancient man of God. Majestic lawgiver of Israel! Faithful Shepherd, who wast ever ready, in that great and terrible wilderness, to lay down thy life for the sheep committed to thy care, we honor thy name and work, whose impress upon all after time is greater than that of any other prophet save thy heavenly Lord! And though hostile critics, some almost as bitter as Korah, Dathan, and Abiram of old, have been working a hundred and twenty years to diminish thy fair fame, and have disputed over thy writings more than Satan ever disputed over thy body, thine eye is yet undimmed, thy vigor unabated. The holy books which bear thy name are themselves thy best apology, and though thou wast but a servant in the house of thy God, thou knewest Jehovah face to face, and hast fittingly been glorified with that transfigured Prophet who, as Son over the house, is truly greater than thou.

ART. II.—THE LAST DAYS OF JOHN WICLIF—HIS DEATH.

"And when a great man dies,
For years beyond our ken,
The light he leaves behind him lies
Upon the path of men."

AT this season, five hundred years ago, John Wiclif was coming near his end. He was sixty years old, prematurely worn and weary, yet so bent upon his sacred labors that some reverent hand indorsed upon his last production, "*Auctoris vita finitur et hoc opus ita*"—(The life that dropped so suddenly below the horizon bears rehearsal well.)

Of his earlier history almost nothing is known. He was born at Wiclif, a little parish on the Tees, near Rokeby. Of his ancestry, his parentage, his boyhood, nothing whatever is on record. Of his forty years' residence at Oxford only one incident is found: not a trace of his habits, not a personal allusion of any kind, can be found in all his writings. At forty he suddenly stands forth from Oxford, as Elijah stood forth from Gilead, without preliminary, to do his work, say his word, and then return to the invisible.

At sixteen he entered Queen's College, and, after a year as commoner, he joined Merton. Sometime before, Oxford had numbered 30,000 students, but at this time had not nearly so many. Since its founding by Alfred, five hundred years before, kings, prelates, and nobles had sought repose for their souls and honor for their names by endowing the various colleges of which the University was composed. Its aggregate wealth was great, and the yearly offerings to it were ample. Its income was spent upon lecturers, corresponding, in the main, to the modern professors; upon the fellows, resident graduates, who were its governing body; and upon the scholars. There was no recitation or routine of daily drill. All was done by lectures, by private study, and by public theses and disputations. The University was intensely religious; it seemed partly shrine and partly monastery. Its inmates, whatever their piety might be—and there was often a ragged edge of barbarism in their manners—were moved with zeal to learning as to a crusade.

Their studies were often trivial—this was before Bacon—but their minds were acute and their ardor noble. The student's success in rhetoric was proved by his use of rhetoric; his attainments in philosophy, by his actual presentation of philosophy.

Wiclif early shone among these thousands. He became an authority in the canon and the civil law. A bitter opponent places him "in philosophy second to none, in scholastic exercises incomparable, struggling to excel all in both subtlety and depth of disputation." The truths of Scripture early occupied his mind, and his college friends, in a pleasant way, used to call him the "Gospel Doctor." In 1350 the black death swept over Christendom, and a third of the people perished. It destroyed in London one hundred thousand persons, and the city sat in sackcloth under the appalling scourge. How often in such times have men apprehended the coming of the final terrors! Wiclif was moved to write his first known work of which a single copy remains, "The Last Age of the Church," a commentary on the Revelation. In 1361, after twenty-one years of study, he was made Master of Baliol College and rector of Fillingham, on the Lincoln levels. He was also made Doctor of Divinity—a title meaning much in those days. His portrait gives us a slight body, a face too old for its years, with full, waving beard, lips firmly set, and an air of weariness; but under his Oxford cap beams a steady eye, there is a depth in the whole look of the man. We find at Lutterworth, also, his dark, carved oaken chair, more strong than handsome, and a few other relics of the greatest heart of a hearty period.

That was a great generation in England, the most telling between Alfred and Elizabeth, and the most trying to the souls of men. Foremost in politics was John of Gaunt, son of Edward III., uncle of Richard II., and father of Henry IV., himself through his wife (that Blanche of whom Chaucer writes in the "Boke") entitled to the crown of Castile—a title that cost him dearly. He was the sturdiest upholder of plain English liberty in Church and State. With him stood Percy, Earl Marshal of England, zealous for freedom as his son Hotspur was for "bright honor;" a man so true and valiant that we doubly mourn when his fortunes went down in blood at Shrewsbury. The growth of liberty caused some excesses. Poverty and suffering from pestilence and Edward's wars were

great, and Wat Tyler's rebellion gave despotism some excuse thereafter. Still, the government of England was the best on which the sun was shining. The peasants were coming, from slaves, to be tenants of cottages and gardens at fixed rentals of money or service—a step in advance of the rest of the world. Thus began that growth of yeomanry that has given England its abiding power.

Among the literary men of this period is a queer identity of name. There has been but one John on the English throne. He was "of presence fouler than hell;" but his signing the Magna Charta gave his name an historic charm for English ears. Around the great Chaucer stood five illustrious Johns, Wiclif, Mandeville, Trevisa, Gower, and Barbour. The great Chaucer, now past the meridian of his years, was still rising toward the meridian of his power. A life-long association with the best society of England and of the Continent, personal acquaintance with the great writers "whose rhetorick so sweet enlumined Italie," and profound study of their works, a lively sense of the beautiful, a deep sympathy with every form of human feeling, and a keen discernment of differences among the mortal millions —these, with growing charms of utterance, were perfecting the author of "Canterbury Tales," the father of English poetry. He was four years younger than Wiclif. The commanding figure, the abstracted air, the courtly bearing of the great poet, who had spent his life in the most polished circles of the world, were in marked contrast with the slender form, the worn face, and keen eye of the great scholar, who until now had rarely gone from the cloisters of his college. One bond of bonds they shared—a love for the undivided Christ, whose honor each was in his own way seeking. (How sweet, like the swan's dying strain, are the last known words from Chaucer's pen: "To that life He us bring, who bought us with his blood! Amen!") They shine upon the sky of their century, differing in quality rather than in glory, and either might be called "lord of the ascendant." Together they shed upon their generation healing and gladness and splendor.

A humbler poet of the period was more closely connected with Wiclif's labors. William Langlande was laureate of the suffering and the poor. He sang from the heart and to the heart of English cottagers. He entered into the toil and

dreariness of their struggling lives. His "Vision of Piers Plowman," a series of dreams, forerunning the "Pilgrim's Progress," gave Christ as he is seen through the clouds of humanity, (somewhat as we find the Gospel in Rembrandt's paintings,) and truth comes in allegory of flesh and blood. He brought duty and patience in living forms to the hearths and homes of the poor, and cheered them with vivid pictures of the heavenly sympathy, the eternal pity, thus opening their hearts for the word that Wiclif was to give them. But we might linger overlong amid the vernal charms of English literature in the last days of Wiclif.

For its early Christian centuries England had been under Rome, not always passive, but never rebellious. The voice of Roger Bacon, the sole remonstrant, had been hushed in the dungeon where he died a hundred years before. King John had bound the kingdom to pay the pope a thousand marks (say, $10,000) a year. For about thirty years this was now unpaid. In 1365 Pope Urban V. sent to Edward III. a demand for its renewal, with payment of arrears. The king laid the matter before Parliament. Now, for the first time, Wiclif appears in public. His hour has come. He leaves his retreat and his loved and sacred task of Bible-translation just begun, and hastens to watch this issue in London. He bows before the king and queen—of England's best. He takes by the hand John of Gaunt, Earl Percy, Chaucer. He was at home among nobles and in the presence of royalty. The pope's claim was boldly handled. "No golden seal of royalty, nor the seals of a few lords whom the king coerced to join him, could supply the place of the national consent." So spoke these speakers. Refused and defied, Urban withdrew his demand. Two hundred years before, the first and ablest Plantagenet, bending his bare head at Becket's tomb, had received three stripes from each of eighty monks and five from each of twenty bishops and abbots; then, leaning barefooted against a pillar, he spent the night in fasting, not so much to avert the anger of Heaven as to appease the offended dignity of Rome. The air had changed in England!

Now arose a difficulty more serious, because internal. The poverty of Christ and his apostles has to some always seemed not merely an incident, but a force in their undertaking and a merit in their condition. Religious orders of, at first, genuine

beggars came into existence. Those founded some two hundred years before this time by Dominic and Francis had by the gifts of the faithful come to be the wealthiest bodies in England. Their establishments were, in architecture and equipment, equal to the noblest cathedrals of the Church. To secure their allegiance the pope exempted them from all control of bishops and all check of parish priests. Able and unscrupulous financiers, and thus a law unto themselves, they domineered the Church and stretched their rule beyond it. They now began a struggle for the control of all primary education and of the chairs in the universities. This roused Wiclif, and he never saw rest again.

From the Parliament that had resisted Urban he obtained an act forbidding their inviting any one to join them under eighteen years old, and ruling them out of the affairs of the university, making the king arbiter in all educational questions. This was a great victory. It marked Wiclif as champion of freedom in faith and learning, but it also marked him for the pitiless wrath of Rome. His clear eyes saw, his deep heart felt, the duty of the hour. "As roll a thousand waves to a rock," so came the friars against Wiclif. "As meets a rock a thousand waves," so Wiclif met the friars. The dispute went, of course, beyond college halls. Wiclif entered the domain of popular controversy, and spent the remainder of his strength in its stormy atmosphere.

In one respect he rose above Luther, Knox, and Calvin, above every Reformer, one thinks, of all time, unless it be that later man of Oxford, John Wesley: it is in his entire freedom from vindictive feeling. There is no insult, no harsh personality, in all his writings. Not one whose opinions or practices he most severely denounced could say that Wiclif was not his best friend. He could, he did, "hate the sin with all the heart, and yet the sinner love." He went to his stern task in the majestic vehemence of an aroused conscience, and never weakened himself by turning from a principle to a person.

One of his attacks was upon Confessions and Pardons, the exciting cause of Luther's movement in following years. Langlande had, in rugged, home-bred English, set forth the shames and wrongs of this system—really that of Indulgences—the dealers in which "rode from manor to manor, with hounds and waiting men." Chaucer gives, with fullness and finish, the

picture of a pardonere, "that streit was comen from the court of Rome."

"His wallet lay before him on his lappe, bret-full of pardons come from Rome all hot." With his "relikes" of saints and sacred things, and his winning "vois,"

> "Upon a day he gat him more moneis
> Than that the persone gat in monethes tweis;
> And thus, with fained flattering and japes,
> He made the persone and the people—apes."

Chaucer was herein of one mind with Wiclif. "There cometh no pardon but of God, and this may not be bought or sold by chattering priests." So said Wiclif loudly, and one may imagine what anger he aroused, what gnashing of teeth!

The wealth of the Church in England, as compared with the general wealth of the realm, was at this time simply enormous. The ecclesiastical income was more than ten millions sterling, (equal to ten times that sum to-day,) or twelve times the revenue of the kingdom. (The income of the Church of England, from its endowments, is now by contrast about one twelfth that of the State, twenty millions, as against two hundred and forty millions. Its income from all sources is about fifty-five millions, but in view of its great expense of keeping up its cathedrals, architecture of all kinds, etc., the Church itself is not rich, but poor.)

The Church owned more than half the soil of England, and that, too, free of taxation. The offerings at shrines, the funeral and other charges, were a separate and immense income. The pope gave the richest preferments to Italians, non-resident, and their aggregate revenue was greater than the king's. Gregory IX. drained England of a sum equal to seven hundred and fifty millions of our dollars.

No wonder that patriots were alarmed. Parliament passed the statutes of Provisors and Præmunire to stop this ruinous drainage by a foreign prelacy. On Gregory's evasion of the statutes, Wiclif went as head of a commission to remonstrate with him at Bruges. After two years of doubtful struggle the victory was with Parliament. Wiclif, for his wise and fearless conduct of the strife, was made, in 1374, rector of Lutterworth, not far from Oxford. He also continued as lecturer on theology in his own college.

In his pulpit and in his lecture-room he discussed the papacy with boldness and freedom. Loud and dark over his head rose muttering the wrath of Rome. He was summoned before a convocation at St. Paul's, but John of Gaunt stood at his side, Earl Percy was not far away, and his foes did nothing. The pope then made out five bulls against Wiclif. Before that addressed to Edward III. arrived, that king had died. Richard II., his grandson and successor, gave the pope's mandate no attention. He was too young for that; and "the good Parliament," that had resisted the pope's demand, had made the above-named statutes, and had begun to confiscate the church property, would give the bulls small favor.

The pope was not in a strong position. He was living at Avignon under the protection of the king of France, and the English despised a "French pope." Enforce his bulls he could not, yet his revenue from England was greater than that of any prince in Christendom. The flock was shaven and shorn, not fed and shepherdized.

At this low stage of spiritual decay Wiclif, roused by the pope's assault, rose up, "covered with zeal as with a cloak." He put his views of individual responsibility into an ideal theory of "dominion." To each human being was given at birth a "dominion founded in grace," as if the Creator's primal word to unfallen man, "Have thou dominion!" were perpetually respoken. In the outer world the power of the bad might constrain this "dominion," and in the mystery of providence the right might serve the wrong, and "God might obey the devil." In the domain of conscience this "dominion," held directly from God, had unbroken dealing immediately with the Giver, and was answerable to him alone. This in its real drift was Protestantism, sweeping away the mediation of priests between man and God, which had become the apparent basis of the Church, and leaving clear that Rock against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. We shall see how, as his outward man grew feebler, his mind grew ever clearer and his courage firmer.

The money question now reappears. The pope's agents were about to take from England, sorely drained by war and pestilence, an enormous sum in gold to aid in restoring his Holiness. Parliament, reluctant to see the departure of such moneys, sub-

mitted to Wiclif this question: "Whether the kingdom of England might not, in case of necessity, detain the treasure of the kingdom, though the pope himself demanded the same under pain of censure?" His reply—who could doubt that?—was, "It can so detain." He now declared, and with emphasis, his views of ecclesiastical endowments.

He held that the Church should be supported by the offerings of the faithful, as a river is fed by fresh, living fountains. He urged that priests should live, not from rents of lands or from taxes on trade, but from such incomes as their labors called forth from a people whose hearts freely responded to a faithful spiritual service. The final control of all properties should rest with the State. This view of Church temporalities brings him abreast of our own time. He stood, as first Protestant, about where Protestants stand to-day.

The clergy were touched by Wiclif's views as the silversmiths of Ephesus were touched by the preaching of St. Paul: "he takes my life, who takes the means by which I live."

Wiclif was summoned to Lambeth for trial on many charges of heresy, one of which really absorbed all others, that of holding that the pope himself was amenable to criticism and correction. The presiding archbishop was Courtenay, the same who had, as Bishop of London, presided at the trial at St. Paul's, where John of Gaunt had threatened to take him by the hair of his head. The prelates, who sat as judges, were awed by the vast concourse of Wiclif's friends from all ranks of society, and he was again victorious. This memorable year, 1377, saw his written defense presented to Parliament and scattered broadcast through the kingdom. In this he abides by his theory of "dominion," held directly and inalienably of Heaven, by virtue of which "he could not be excommunicated by the pope unless he were first excommunicated by himself." "He layeth the beams of his chamber upon the waters," and they rest securely, though the waves roar and be troubled. Wiclif had now from a Reformer become a Protestant, when his growing power seemed at once annihilated and his whole work undone. Wat Tyler's insurrection broke out. John of Gaunt and his party were paralyzed. Before the common danger from the maddening peasantry the prelates and the barons came to peace. It is not strange that they charged the outbreak on Wiclif, for

some of his followers were in it. He boldly claimed that he was ministering oil and wine to wounds that he had no share in making. It is, however, here that we must mark the end of his political power. The odium of the Peasant's Revolt, which he, least of all, deserved, took from him the alliance and sympathy of the aristocratic party.

The last tie between him and John of Gaunt, now aged and irritable, was broken when Wiclif denied transubstantiation. This standing miracle in the ritual of the mass filled the worshipers with awe, and set the humblest priest, in whose sacred hands it was achieved, above all earthly dignities. In 1381 Wiclif uttered his denial of this most central and impressive of all the Romish doctrines. In this he stood alone. The University of Oxford at once condemned. He promptly challenged to a disproval of his views any doctor or chancellor. None ventured, the panic subsided, his opponents vanished, and the university silently acquiesced in the conclusions of its great master. It was more serious that John of Gaunt enjoined him to be silent. With a pen of truer stuff than the great duke's sword, Wiclif wrote to his patron an avowal of his doctrine, calmly adding, "I believe that in the end the truth will conquer."

He now began a movement never before known in English history. The barons and the university, the supporters of his earlier efforts, he could count upon no longer. He turned squarely to the people of England. Flinging aside his Latin and his scholastic argumentation that had won the applause of learned throngs, he set himself to address the common mind in the common tongue. His genius overmastered the enterprise. He created at once a language and a rhetoric, appealing to the people in words that needed no expounding, and in sentences clear, energetic, and inspiring. His prose—he is called the father of English prose—is to-day terse, ringing, and intelligible to all plain English listeners, whether among the miners of Yorkshire, the tradesmen of London, or the cowboys of Colorado. Pamphlet after pamphlet he wrote and circulated full of daring denials, backed by brief, clear arguments, of most that Rome held dear—of pardons, indulgences, absolutions, the worship of saints, and pilgrimages to shrines. How these went abroad in the land we shall see presently. They went

evesy-where, and they worked so effectually that it came to be said that every second man was a Wiclifite.

Postponing discussion of his Bible-work until we have traced his career as reformer, we hope still to avoid confusion of ideas.

In 1382 Courtenay, Wiclif's bitterest opposer, presented to a council twenty-four propositions taken from his works for official condemnation. During the discussion an earthquake shook London, but the fierce primate explained it to the frightened council as an omen of what they should do to heresy, and ten propositions were condemned. Courtenay enjoined the chancellor to silence the preaching of these things at Oxford. "I dare not," was the answer. Such was the influence of the "Gospel Doctor" in the home of his life, the center of his labors. The king and council had made an order enforcing the decree of Courtenay. Wiclif procured the recall of this order. Victory gave him no rest. The relentless archbishop, triumphant as he was, through John of Gaunt's favor, (how changed within five years!) over free thought and speech at Oxford, dared not proceed further against Wiclif. An alliance was framed between the prelates and those Franciscans and Dominicans whom Wiclif, as reformer, had so grievously offended. We saw them hostile to each other. "Pilate and Herod are made friends to-day," said he, bitterly; "they made a heretic of Christ: it is easy for them to count simple Christians heretics." They summoned him in 1383 before the Convocation of Oxford, as being a member of the university, to be tried for his denial of the Real Presence. He was sick, but he roused himself for his answer with amazing energy. He not only sent to the king and Parliament a petition for a full hearing, but he attacked his enemies with new vigor. He restated all his points of doctrine, and demanded the free teaching of his views of the Eucharist, and this in the shadow of the cloud portentous of his ruin.

At length he came before his Convocation. In this, his last answer, no man stood by him. He was in a dreary case, feeble, friendless, and alone, amid scowling enemies. Such change had come in his old home! He made his defense, and never had he shone so brightly as master of learning and logic. His enemies could not resist the wisdom and power with which he

spake. Set to condemn him, they expressed no judgment, but they summarily expelled him from the university. This was his last trial, his last triumph, his last indignity. He rose up and turned his weary feet from that seat of learning where for forty years he, the last of the great schoolmen, had been the chief luminary, and which, since its founding, none had so adorned with a great and venerable name, or had so fulfilled the founder's prayer. He found a safe retreat at Lutterworth.

Let us now review the task which absorbed his energies, which gave him his greatest influence and his enduring fame. Ardent as Wiclif was for the welfare of England and the Church, he well knew that conviction, zeal, and love, which give doctrine all its life, must be nourished by the divine Mind, the eternal Heart. Reformers come and go, but the word of God abides forever.

In 1360 he set himself to the translation of the Bible into English. For this work he had come to a moral fitness by profound and patient study, by which he was convinced that the Bible alone gives a full and faultless rule of faith and practice. "God's will," he said, "is plainly revealed in the two Testaments, which a Christian man, well understanding, may thence gather sufficient knowledge during his pilgrimage here on earth."

He decided that England's greatest need was the Bible for the people, without note or comment, to be illuminated and enforced upon their apprehension by the eternal Spirit. To furnish this became the sole and sacred task of his life, to which most of his other doings were but incidental. Years had told heavily upon his slender frame, and palsy was touching his arm; but there was clearness in his thought and unfaltering courage in his spirit.

His was the first version in a modern tongue of Europe, as the Russian, of 1877, is the last. Between Alfred, who translated the Commandments, and Wiclif, five or six had done something of this work, but in 1360 the Psalms alone were known in English. He made his version from the Latin, the Vulgate of Jerome, not from "The Greek and Hebrew of the Holy Ghost." Two men were effectual helpers. Nicolas Herford worked with him on the Old Testament until, under imprisonment and threat of worse for heresy, he forsook Wiclif.

The other, John Purvey, comforted his master's declining years, and after his death completed, in 1395, a revision of his work.

In his retreat, at Lutterworth, Wiclif toiled at this great task—toiled patiently and hopefully. If once that Book were in the people's hands, his foes might do as they liked with *him;* the light thus kindled they would never be able to extinguish! About some items of his work there hangs an obscurity. Whether he began with the Psalms or the Revelation; whether he finished the entire Bible, or the New Testament only, in 1380; whether, even, he began his work in 1360 or 1378, are questions debatable but unimportant. Clearly, this was the absorbing task of his later years, at which he toiled by his late evening lamp in winter, and in the early sunlight of summer, now at his college, and now at his rectory, that he might unveil to common eyes the sacred truth. He would add nothing of note or comment. His theory of "dominion with grace" involved the right of private judgment. If the Bible might but lie on the cotter's table, he would leave to the Holy Ghost, not to trammels of human comment, the guiding of the cotter's opinions.

December 2, 1380, is fairly taken as the era of Wiclif's Bible, an era for England and for mankind. Though this was a lifetime before the art of printing the Book, yet penmanship was now in its golden age in England, and the copying of manuscripts was not only a fine art, but also the bread-winning vocation of thousands. The Book hastened on its errand. Richard's queen, Anne of Bohemia, read it early and to good purpose. She brought many of her countrymen to Oxford for biblical study. Thus were carried to Bohemia those ideas for which, in the next century, Huss and Jerome laid down their lives. Many of the nobility patronized the work after the queen's example, and of the middle classes numbers aided in the cost and labor of the ample copying.

Now came into happy service a class of laborers whom Wiclif had already raised up and organized, the forerunners of Wesley's itinerants, or even of Booth's soldiers. They were "the simple priests." The clergy laughed at their rude sermons and long russet frocks, but the common people heard them gladly. These at once began to read the Bible to crowds that bent forward entranced as those who, after a long night,

catch the flush of rising dawn. And now in English homes was a music before unknown!

It is a crisis in the history of a language, one of intense linguistic interest, when it is made the vehicle of the divine Word, as the Chinese has in our day illustrated. It is always attendant upon a crisis in the religious history of a people. How forcible, then, are right words—phrases that readily blend with the popular thought and tinge the common consciousness! Wiclif's English was equal to the demand, and the Holy Ghost was not straitened therein. All that holy men of old had spoken came to his countrymen in its original fullness and power. To him we owe our sacred dialect; a style of our language which all recognize and reverence, and from which none of our versions has departed. How "tuneful sweet" is this! (Matt. vii, 27:) "And rayn came down, floodis camen, and wyndis blowen, and thei hurliden into that house, and it felle down, and the falling down thereof was grate."

When Wiclif was driven from Oxford the glory of the university departed. Soon it had but a fifth of the students that had crowded to hear the "Gospel Doctor." In our day the venerable institution has reared the monument of the illustrious scholar whom it was compelled to repudiate. Under its patronage two faithful men, Forshal and Madden, after more than twenty years of labor, have given in four ample folios the version of Wiclif, and that revision which he began and Purvey finished, through the university press. In the Chicago Library these noble volumes, given by Oxford to the city after the fire, with pages like prairies and print undimmed by the industrial atmosphere, offer endless charm to the student of sacred thought and of the English tongue.

Now louder rose the cry of heresy. Wiclif stood up and hurled the word back on those who shouted it: "Those are heretics who hold that the law of God may be learned only from the lips of priests, and that men should not have it in the language best known to them." During his life Rome made no effectual hinderance. Copies of the Bible were scattered far and wide. A few years before this, Queen Philippa had taught her people to cheer their homes by using coal as fuel. By introducing coal as she had done, she had inaugurated England's career as a nation great by its great industries. A similar work

did Wiclif in English hearts. The results on private piety and public conscience went to prepare England for her place as the foremost Christian nation.

Rome looked on the Bible in English with those eyes always and every-where the same. She hated it with a perfect hatred. In 1390 a bill condemning it and forbidding its circulation, was introduced into the House of Lords. Gaunt was there, and rousing himself in the noble spirit of his nobler days, he procured the rejection of the bill. It could hardly have passed the Commons, and Richard was in favor of the Bible. Foiled in Parliament, the priests kept their wrath warm by the passage of the Arundel Constitution, a decree purely ecclesiastical. Its purport was, that no unauthorized person should translate into English any part of the Holy Scripture, or read in public or private any such translation, under pain of the greater excommunication; that is, the committing of the body to the flames, and of the soul to the devil. This terrible decree awaited its time like a sword sharp and bright in its scabbard.

Its time came. Richard's great error placed himself in a dungeon to die, and his cousin on the throne to reign. This was John of Gaunt's son, Henry IV. of Lancaster. All was now changed. Henry was like his father in the energy and intellect that marked the whole Plantagenet line, but with piety and freedom he had no sympathy. To gain the support of the priests he let them have their own way. They quickly drew that blade, and red it was ere they returned it! To possess any portion of Wiclif's Bible was made a capital crime. Houses were searched, and men and women were put to death for having or reading a scrap of Scripture. It was a reign of terror indeed!

We were noticing Wiclif's "simple priests." To these had joined themselves a large class of humble helpers, readers of the Bible from house to house, as are now so many good women in the zenanas of India and the homes of Japan. They took with them also tracts of his writing in the plain, strong speech of plowmen and mechanics, the first hearty specimens of our pamphlet prose. On these poor servants of Christ, known as Lollards or Babblers, fell the stroke of wrath. They drank of their Master's cup, and were baptized with his baptism. As Herod had done with James, the brother of John, because he

saw it pleased the Jews, so did Henry with these faithful men because he saw it pleased the priests.

The smoke of their burning gave the air of England a taint unknown for a thousand years, since the Druids had vanished from the groves that they had made awful with human sacrifice. Such deeds were shocking in the son of Gaunt! These poor men were his best subjects. He was not a Nero to enjoy this havoc. He wished the favor of Rome, and this was its price! Wiclif's work was not wiped out. Hundreds of his manuscripts survived; some sewed into bedding; some built into walls; some buried in the earth. They fed, even in troublous times, that secret conscience, that silent grasp of truth and freedom, that prepared five millions to be turned to Protestantism in a day, and Henry VIII. so turned them because they wished to be turned. So with action and counteraction has England fared on toward becoming what Wiclif wished it to be and tried to make it.

Let us resume his personal history. After his expulsion from Oxford he came up no more out of his dearly loved parish of Lutterworth. Few and feeble were his days now remaining. His central work was the revising of his translation—of which he might have said in Angelo's words concerning his masterpiece at Florence, "Like thee I will not build; better than thee I cannot"—for how is the revision an improvement upon the translation? But this weapon, on which to the last he was forging, was in other hands to work the discomfiture of his foes and Truth's. He was assiduous in the care of his flock, and so vigorous was his mind that three hundred of his parish sermons, clear, fervent, and practical, escaping his enemies, have come down to our day. So did the flame burn brightly until the mortal socket was at last reached and consumed.

The English prelates now appealed to the pope, and obtained a brief ordering Wiclif to appear at Rome. We may know what that meant! Toward Rome heretics walked with unreturning feet. He made answer to the effect that his failing health compelled him to forego such pleasure. The last words from his pen may be quoted from this answer, in which the courage that never quailed assumes the tone of irony. "I am always glad," said he, "to explain my faith to any one, and above all to the Bishop of Rome; for I take it for granted that if it be ortho-

dox, he will confirm it; if it be erroneous, he will correct it. I assume, too, that as chief vicar of Christ upon earth the Bishop of Rome is of all mortal men most bound to the law of Christ's Gospel, for among the disciples of Christ a majority is not reckoned by simply counting heads in the fashion of this world, but according to the imitation of Christ on either side. Now Christ, during his life upon earth, was of all men the poorest, casting from him all worldly authority. I deduce from these premises, as a simple counsel of my own, that the pope should surrender all temporal authority to the civil power, and advise his clergy to do the same."

The words of Wiclif, the first Protestant, are ended, nor could they have ended more fittingly!

He died at his post. He was conducting divine service on the last Sunday of 1384 with his loved and loving people of Lutterworth. Paralysis came down to him with noiseless, air-drawn touch, as of an angel's beckoning finger. He was borne from his church like a warrior from a field of battle. He was at rest. His last days had been twenty years of stormy strife, in which every day had seen a battle, and every battle a victory, and now came three days of heavenly peace. His soul overflowed with gladness, a kindly light was on his face, and he seemed to breathe the air of paradise. In the closing hours of the year he entered upon the eternal years amid the solemn troops and sweet societies of the true and the brave on high. Devout men carried Wiclif to his burial, and made great lamentation over him.

The church of St. Mary, that in which he preached and in which he was buried, still overlooks the pleasant town of Lutterworth. It is of the pointed architecture that prevailed in the century before Wiclif, and though its boast is of but one great and illustrious name, we look on it with a concentered sensibility unfelt in Westminster Abbey. There hangs his portrait on the vestry wall; in that pulpit he was preaching when "Heaven's usher of the white rod" touched him to escort him elsewhere; on that table he wrote; in that chair he died; he even wore that tattered robe, a very shred of which one might beg for memory! And the quiet waters of that stream were once strewn with his ashes! The lapse of time that deals heavily on this old building, leaves that still beautiful which

once was so, and the associations here are fresh and unwithering. The thoughtful tourist will rather leave some places of more pretense unvisited.

Years passed on, and up to the end of the century the dawn of Reformation grew warmer and brighter. Other times then came, as we have already indicated. In 1400 Chaucer died. John of Gaunt was already gone. Only one of Wiclif's great protectors, Percy, father of Hotspur, was remaining. Henry IV., following Richard II., gave all his influence to Rome, and the followers of Wiclif fell on evil times and evil tongues. They found no comforter, none to hinder the swift wrath of their foes from its dire sweep of vengeance. Their master's writings were publicly burned, and every curse found in the Romish formulas of anathema was heaped upon his name. But how could they degrade him to whom the Master had said, "Well done!" How disquiet him who had entered into the joy of his Lord!

One weak display of hatred, like that which disgraces the foes of Oliver Cromwell, was within their reach. The bones of the heretic, buried in the chancel of the church where he had preached, were defiling a consecrated ground. His enemies had long chafed in vexation over his peaceful death and burial. "Strange, indeed," says Fuller, "that a hare hunted with so many packs of dogs should die at last quietly sitting on his form!"

In 1428, when in the ruin of the Lollards all spiritual life seemed trodden out in England—when the profligacy of the "Club Parliament" and the avarice and cruelty of the army in France blackened the English name—when in all Christendom the one pure, heroic figure was Joan of Arc—in this midnight of Church and State the last foul deed was done. Wiclif's remains were unearthed and burned upon the bridge spanning the little river Swift, that runs past Lutterworth, and the ashes thrown into the stream to defile English soil no longer. Rejected from consecrated ground, he gained a boundless sepulcher. "The whole earth," says Pericles, in his funeral oration, "is the tomb of illustrious men." Fuller says, "This brook did convey his ashes to the Avon, Avon into the Severn, Severn into the narrow seas, they into the main ocean; and thus the ashes of Wiclif were the emblems of his doctrine, which is

now dispersed the wide world over." So, indeed, it is dispersed! On what shore has the Bible in English not been read! What laws and institutions of our race has it not affected! In what country has it not caused some one to say, "My spiryt hath gladid in God my helthe!" (From the Magnificat, Luke i, 46.) It has influenced every generation that has "hastened stormfully across the stage out of the darkness east into the darkness west."

In 1455, seventy years after Wiclif's death, the first book was printed. It was the Mazarin Bible in Latin, of which six copies are said to be now existing; one being in the Lenox Library of New York, another at Hartford. About twenty years later Caxton printed a Bible in England. Thus within a century came two great biblical epochs of transition—from Latin into English, and from penmanship into print. Think of the slow toil of Wiclif's penman, and then note that since 1804 Bible societies alone (to say nothing of other publishers) have printed and distributed more than one hundred and eighty million Bibles, Testaments, and portions of Scripture! But we must take our leave of the great Schoolman, Translator, Reformer, and Protestant. It is fitting to pause at the five hundredth anniversary of his death, the last day of this year. "Wist ye not that this daye is a prince, nay, a greate manne fallen doune in Israel?" The lips of those that can speak well should rehearse his virtues and his toils, and all who love and have freedom by the truth should glorify God in him.

Wiclif! Now half a thousand years are sped
Since to the music of our English tongue
Those thin white fingers cunningly did wed
What holy men of old had said or sung!

First Protestant! First scholar for the poor!
First to tell out in homeborn, fireside speech,
To simple folk within their cottage-door,
What words of life those sacred lips did teach.

As comes the star upon the dim, sad sky
To tell of dawn upon its rosy way,
So from our Orient, serene and high,
Thy beams presage our bright and golden day.

Hard was thy task, strong Heart! Still struggling on
Against the scowl of bitter monk and priest,
Palsied and sick; and yet thy work was done,
And follows thee, now entered into rest.

Bend from thy rest, if it be given, O Saint,
Now worn and baffled in thy toil no more!
Hark! How thy language, tuneful, clear, and quaint,
Tells the glad tidings upon every shore!

What though thy foes in feebleness of wrath
Thine ashes on the wandering waters flung?
The reverent waters smoothed for thee a path
O'er smiling tides all lands and isles among.

And when thy work's millennium shall be,
Can that millennium yet linger long,
When o'er all nations Truth has victory,
And Peace lifts up her sweet and endless song?

ART. III.—THE LOGIC OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF.

THE logic of religious belief has always been a puzzle even to religious thinkers, and a downright scandal to the irreligious. As we look along the line of human thinking we see a number of perennial beliefs which seem to exist apart from logic, and often in defiance of it. The existence of God, the efficacy of prayer, a moral government of the universe, and life beyond the grave, are examples. Men have always made a show of argument for these beliefs, but often, it would seem, mainly for form's sake. The arguments offered have varied from age to age, and often from man to man. Moreover, even religious thinkers have rejected all of them at one time or another as illogical and worthless. In every case, soon or later, there comes a point where strict logical consecution fails, and where the passage from premise to conclusion is made by an appeal to faith, or feeling, or some other illogical element. And yet, to the dismay of the logicians, the beliefs live on in perennial freshness and power. In such cases it would seem that we do not hold our beliefs because we can prove them, but we try occasionally to prove them because we hold them; and finally, we insist on holding them whether we can prove them or not.

This state of affairs has given rise to manifold speculations. Many religious thinkers have seen in these facts a proof that religious truth does not come within the jurisdiction of logic, and they have moved to change the venue by an appeal to feeling,

or to some special faith-faculty or religious sentiment. Intuitions, too, have been largely appealed to and highly esteemed. The eagle soul, it was said, has wings, and should soar to the mountain-top instead of painfully dragging itself upward by the sole force of beak and claws. The more gifted declared that they had no need of aid from either logic or revelation, as they possessed the witness in themselves. They were quite content to resign religious arguments to be hacked and hewed by irreligious logicians, and, indeed, they did not a little of this work themselves. Some of the severest critics of the attempt to reason out religious truth have been believers. From this high stand-point of faith, or sentiment, or intuition, many even ventured to make an onslaught on the speculative faculty itself. The metaphysicians have not succeeded well enough in their attempts to construct a logical theory of things to make an alliance with them especially desirable. We need only mention the names of Plato, Descartes, Leibnitz, Spinoza, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Kant, Hegel, Mill, Bain, and Spencer, to see that the speculative faculty has not much room for the pride of success. The human race has done some fantastic things in the ways of religion, but certainly nothing more fantastic than it has done in the way of speculation. From the beginning, speculators have been a race "mad with logic and fed on chimeras," so that the very term has become a reproach. There have always been men possessed of the speculative mania who have flown in the face of consciousness and good sense, and who have denied all the principles by which men and nations live, simply to carry through a theory. Mephistopheles was certainly right when he declared that "a speculating fellow is like a beast on blasted heath led round in circles by an evil spirit." Science itself did not begin until it left off logic-chopping, and took to studying facts. As long as men tried to tell what could be and what could not be, instead of inquiring what is, words and empty formalism were the only result. Within the Church, also, periods of rationalizing have always been periods of dearth and death; so much so, that rationalism has become almost synonymous with irreligion. Many have succeeded in arguing themselves out of religion, but seldom into it. Facts of this kind have strengthened the conviction that religion must have other than a speculative basis. It would be

too bad if one could not be moral until some one had constructed a theory of morals, and had solved all the metaphysical puzzles which lie at the foundation of a moral theory. It would be too bad if we could not worship except as permitted by some ephemeral system of metaphysics. It is not to be thought of, then, that religion should be forced to carry any speculative system, whether it be the Leibnitzian monads, the Herbartian reals, the Hegelian idealism, or even the doctrine of evolution.

To one sore from the buffetings, and grieved by the gainsayings, of logic, such freedom could not fail to be welcome. It seems to be a distinct teaching of experience; and it also sets religion on high, far above logic and its wordy wars. But it has likewise its disadvantages. It looks like an admission that religion has nothing for the reason or the intellect. It is rather a kind of "dark lantern of the spirit" which is not to be used in the realm and light of intelligence. The latter must always remain an unbeliever, and look coldly on while heart and conscience worship. Moreover, the feelings and intuitions, left to themselves, have made very sorry work of it. Feelings have grown faint and intuitions dim. It has been very hard to adjust them to one another, and harder still to adjust their psychology. Hence in the realm of religion itself there has long been an oscillation between rationalism and sentimentalism, and a chronic inability to rest in either.

To irreligious thinkers, on the other hand, the illogical nature of religious reasoning has always been a scandal. They have armed themselves with a logic variously described as rigorous, remorseless, relentless, pitiless, etc., and with this they have produced numberless formulas of exorcism against religion. These extend from single syllogisms and epigrams to bulky volumes, and have been incessantly repeated over the possessed for centuries, but without effect. Occasionally a fresh speculator, generally young and inexperienced, re-utters a familiar exorcism with unwonted warmth, and looks confidently to see the evil spirit depart; but, somehow, if the demon does vanish for a time, he soon comes back in a worse form than before. For example, Comte drove out Christianity and ended by setting up a mixed system of ancestor and progeny worship. Strauss and Clifford, also, after getting clear of God, propose to us to worship the Cosmos, thus getting back to nature-

worship. Suggestions of similar atavism in religion are not wanting in much current speculation. So the rare and choice minds which for a time were empty, swept, and garnished, and, which, indeed, were most efficient in pronouncing the exorcising formulas, become themselves possessed by the evil spirit, and that, too, in a somewhat degraded form. This disappointing outcome of their well-meant endeavors has soured, somewhat, our irreligious thinkers. They conclude that religion does belong to our nature, but to the irrational side of it. It may be based on feeling or instinct, or on some blind impulse; at any rate, it is not based on reason. As rational, we are not religious; and as religious, we are not rational. They regret, of course, to see the irrational win such a victory over the rational, especially as such vast practical interests are involved; but this must be reckoned to the innate stupidity of the universe, which is but a poor affair after all. Here the ways divide. Some regard the religious sentiment as a temporary product of development, but as something which cannot safely be disregarded while it lasts. So they look over their speculative treasures to find a sop with which to quiet it, not without a sigh, however, at finding humanity so set in costly delusions. What progress might not the race make if the money and energy expended in bootless worship were devoted to the scientific training and amelioration of mankind. Others, again, are less patient and more determined. Religion, they declare, is nothing but a projection of human desire and passion upon the external universe, and is believed simply because men want to believe it. As for the argument in its favor, it is so weak that it would be immoral to accept it. They are quite at a loss to know whether the persistency of religious teachers in maintaining their superstitions is due to imbecility or to immorality. These teachers, they say, instead of proving their doctrines, preach them. Most of them, of course, are utterly ignorant of the controversies which rage about the foundations of their doctrines. One would think that before preaching religion it would be well to find out whether there is such a thing as religion. But the preachers go on praying and preaching when the whole world knows that the bottom fell out of religion long ago. Evidently they think it compatible with honesty to teach what they do not know. Still we must not be too hard on men who

have to make their living. Some get a living in one way, and some in another. Utterances of this sort are familiar to every reader. In one shape or another they form the staple of the "trenchant arraignments" of religion in which polemic literature abounds.

The solution of this outstanding puzzle must be sought in a better knowledge of the psychology of belief; for the puzzle itself arises from a false theory of belief. We shall see that the charge of bad logic lies equally against our entire mental procedure. We shall see also that our deepest beliefs are not deduced, but grow; they are not made by logic, but developed from life. In fact, in these fierce demands for logic there is an almost infantile oversight of the conditions of human existence and of the facts of mental development. They rest upon the implicit assumption that man is an abstract speculator without any sort of practical interests or necessities. Hence he must begin, like Descartes, by rejecting all postulates and assumptions of every kind in order to find some invincible fact or principle; and when this is found, he must admit nothing which cannot be deduced from it. Wherever he comes to the end of his logic he must stop. If this ideal were adopted we should have only knowledge in the mental outcome, and belief would be unknown. Again, if we were purely abstract speculators, this ideal might be made the standard of our mental operations. But as it is, this ideal applies only to mathematics. Here we begin with self-evident intuitions, and deduce our conclusions from them with perfectly cogent logic. Mathematics is the field of knowledge, and knows nothing of belief. It will not even hear of probability, except as a subject of discussion, and the truths reached about probabilities are themselves not probable but demonstrated. But this idea is inapplicable to reality, and the method is speculatively barren. By means of it Descartes came to his "I think, therefore I am," and there he stuck fast. He could reach neither the world of things, nor the world of persons, nor the world of laws. The method was very rigorous, but it left thought without any object. It is well known that no theory of perception whatever can demonstrate that the apparent object exists apart from perception. That something not ourselves exists is certain, but that that something is identical with sense-objects is not only unproved

but unprovable. The difficulty in laying the idealistic specter is proof of this. Our world-vision is primarily an effect in us, but that the cause must be like the effect cannot be demonstrated. Again, in daily life we live on a basis of probability. Most of the axioms by which men and societies live admit of no demonstration. Practical life, from the humblest concerns of the poor up to the guidance of states, is a kind of knack; and no one makes so sorry work in this field as the fanatical logician. In this field, too, thought has the sole function of guiding life. It does not exist for itself, but only for its outcome. Hence the great aim is not to be technically logical, or speculatively correct, but to be practically successful. This is the great realm of common sense, where practical sagacity is worth more than theory, and where the ability to bring things to pass outweighs any amount of impracticable logic. Some great thinkers, notably Kant, have claimed that thought never has any other than this practical, or teleological, function. The history of speculation shows that thought can only lose itself in pathless labyrinths when it aims at speculative knowledge. It should therefore be restricted to the practical ends which are set for us either by our physical life or by our moral and religious nature; and the attempt formally to prove or disprove fundamental beliefs should be looked upon as a mark of arrested, or at least incomplete, development. We need not subscribe to this extreme view, however, to see that the speculative ideal is inapplicable to practical life, and that belief is molded by practical aims and necessities rather than by the processes of logic.

The true nature of belief can never be understood apart from this fact. The human mind is practical rather than speculative. It lives and acts and has experiences long before it speculates and theorizes. In its practical unfolding, it adjusts itself in a measure to the universe, but in a still greater measure it adjusts the universe to itself. In so doing it makes a great variety of practical postulates and assumptions which are not logical deductions, but a kind of *modus vivendi* which the mind has established with the great world of things. The mind does not ask whether it has a right to live, but it lives; and in living it develops a frame-work of principles which represent the conditions of its fullest life. It has not time to speculate;

it assumes. It has not time to theorize; it takes for granted. The pressure of practical existence is upon it; and it must adjust itself practically before it can attend to speculative problems. Thus man did not begin by inquiring into the implications of ethical existence and by settling all the metaphysical difficulties involved therein, but he began by being ethical, and by implicitly assuming all which that implies. He did not prove that he had a right to be ethical, but he found himself such. He did not resolve the metaphysical puzzles in the notion of freedom, but he found himself compelled to regard himself and his fellows as responsible, and hence as free. Likewise, man did not begin by demonstrating the possibility and obligation of religion, and by proving that the objects and relations which it implies exist, but he began by being religious, and by assuming those objects and relations. They were implied in being religious, and he was as sure of them as he was of his religion. No more did man begin by theories of knowledge and by routing all skeptics and agnostics; but he began by knowing as a matter of course. No one can hope to understand the mind who regards it as a logic-machine. It is rather a living organism with manifold interests and necessities, and without thought of logic it proceeds to assimilate the universe to them. The result is, an outgrowth of beliefs, which are the outcome, not of logic, but of life. They are not reasoned truths, but represent the tendencies of our nature, or a mental concordat with existence.

These considerations, however, only refer to the origin of belief, and do not establish its truth. We may allow that belief has a highly complex genesis which admits of no very clear presentation; but we must not affirm that therefore belief has no accountability to logic. That men do believe does not prove that they have a right to believe. Hence, after the genesis of a belief has been described its truth remains an open question. It is therefore the province of logic to go through the luxuriant growths of credulity and cut down such as cannot prove their right to exist. This brings us to the distinction between the causes and the grounds of belief, and raises the question, What constitutes the grounds of belief?

This question also can best be answered by observing the actual procedure of the mind. Beliefs fall into two classes

which are psychologically very different. Beliefs of the first class are those which are deduced from facts, either as their explanation or as their consequence. They are not knowledge because they do not compel acceptance; but they may be rational, because the probabilities are in their favor. Scientific theories are examples, and so are the manifold assumptions and expectations which make up what we call common sense. A physicist believes in the ether or a chemist believes in the atoms because the phenomena seem to call for the assumption. A man says, "I think it will rain to-morrow," or, "I think there will be a financial crisis or a European war before long." All of these beliefs have a double peculiarity. First, they are founded on objective facts, and are offered either as explaining the facts or as resulting from them. Second, their strength varies directly with the objective evidence. If new facts are found which do not fit easily into the scientific theory, doubt begins. If the clouds grow thinner, or the barometer rises, we are not so firm in our expectation of rain. If we hear that the crops are turning out better than we expected, we begin to think of postponing the crisis. All such beliefs belong to the realm of probability; that is, our belief rises and falls with the amount of objective evidence. We take all the facts into account, and our belief is the resultant average. Beliefs of the second class are not founded on objective facts, but on subjective tendencies, and express only subjective interests or postulates. They are not inferences from given facts, either as their explanation or as their consequence. They are rather the implication of our nature itself, or its reaction against our total experience. They are also psychologically different from the preceding class of beliefs in that they are not matters of probability, and our conviction does not rise or fall with each new fact experienced, but only with the intensity of the emotion which produced it. In the realm of probability, opposing facts weaken belief; but here they are set aside as something not understood, and do not weaken our faith.

The belief in God illustrates both classes of belief, as it is really a compound of both. Theistic faith has a double root in our mental life. First, God appears as an hypothesis to explain the facts of experience, or to satisfy the demand of the reason for a sufficient cause. As thus conceived, theism belongs

to the realm of probabilities, and our faith should vary directly as the evidence. Second, God appears as the implication of our esthetic, moral, and religious nature, or as satisfying certain subjective interests, tendencies, and emotions. From this standpoint our faith in God is less an inference than an assumption; or rather, it is an act of faith which varies with no estimate of probabilities, but only with the strength of the feelings which produced it. When these feelings are very strong, the faith is called an intuition, and the proposal to prove the divine existence is derided as needless, and, perhaps, resented as sacrilege. Every step toward argument is a step away from that living apprehension of God in which alone he can be truly known. Sometimes this exalted state of feeling is erected into a special organ, or faculty, which is the true medium of spiritual vision and divine revelation. But apart from these extravagances, theistic faith cannot be understood without taking account of its double source. Plato and Aristotle furnish instructive examples of the double function of theistic doctrine. Aristotle seeks only the God of reason. Plato seeks also the God of beauty and of conscience. With the former, God is metaphysically conceived and has only a metaphysical function: with the latter, God is conceived as the living and righteous God, as delighting in beauty, as maintaining a moral government over an empire of souls, and as administering righteous retribution in a future life. Unfortunately, most writers on natural theology have theoretically recognized only the argumentative source of theism. They propose to demonstrate the existence of God, or at least to render it rationally probable, by an objective consideration of facts. Their apparent success is largely due to a verbal identification of the being reached by their argument with the living God of Christianity. When power and skill in a somewhat indefinite degree have been made probable, this has been viewed as a proof of the Divine Existence in a religious sense. The esthetic demand for perfection, and the moral and religious nature, come in so naturally and spontaneously to expand this poor result into a divine ideal, that the flaw in the logic is overlooked.

That this is so, especially appears from the treatment of the problem of evil and of the divine goodness. A purely objective study of the facts, without any admixture of subjective

interests, would certainly stop short of the conception of God as at once self-centered omnipotence and perfect holiness and goodness. Such a study would aim only to find a causal explanation of the facts; and it cannot be shown that only a perfectly good and all-powerful being would be a sufficient cause. The argument for the divine holiness and goodness is based partly on the happiness of sensitive beings, but mostly on the moral nature of man. These facts, it is said, demand a moral and benevolent cause. Unfortunately, the argument rests on selected facts and ignores the rest. But over against the facts of happiness are the facts of misery, and these are neither few nor insignificant. They cannot be shown to be due to any eternal truths of reason, nor to any ontological necessity. So far as we can see, they are contingent upon an order which might have been otherwise to advantage. Likewise, over against the facts of man's moral nature, are those features of the cosmic process which make against all our ideas of righteousness. If not positively opposed to morality, the world-order is at least awfully indifferent to our moral ideals. To such an extent is this true, that the common judgment of the race has been that a future life is absolutely necessary to save the divine justice and goodness. Manifestly the divine goodness cannot be concluded from these facts, and yet they belong to the facts which must be taken into account in a purely causal explanation. If such an explanation only were needed, an Epicurean indifference to finite well-being, or an element of moral caprice in the First Cause, would be an adequate hypothesis. They are not rejected because they are metaphysically inadequate, but because they are esthetically, ethically, and religiously obnoxious. We demand an explanation which shall satisfy the conscience as well as the intellect. Accordingly, we interpret the First Cause morally; and the facts which make against this view are set aside as something not understood. We believe in a solution whose possibility we cannot now comprehend. Hence the chief strength of the arguments for the divine goodness is directed to showing that the facts of evil and suffering are not incompatible therewith. If we have the idea, we may hold it fast even in the face of the world's pain and sorrow and sin; but the positive source of the idea is not to be found in any ætiological study of the facts of existence,

but rather in the unwillingness to be put to any such utter moral and volitional confusion as would result from allowing a fundamentally immoral, or capricious, or malignant God. Hence the claim often made by Christian writers, that speculative arguments for the existence of God are religiously worthless, is not without some justification. The same fact appears also in the development of Christian theology. The necessity of finding a conception of God which should be satisfactory to our moral nature, has been the great spring of theological progress. Our conceptions have been greatly modified thereby, and the result has been the abandonment of many views which were logical enough, but which did violence to conscience. The older Calvinism was not obnoxious to the reason, but to the moral sense. The debate which led to its modification was carried on with weapons drawn, not from logic, but from conscience. The only function of logic was to show that the theory was shut up to objectionable ethical results. These results, however, were rejected on their own account; for men took for granted that conscience is entitled to a voice in deciding what may be believed. These facts in the natural history of belief, show that belief is by no means always born of a logical contemplation of facts, with the aim of discovering either their causes or their consequences; but that it is often an expression of the entire soul, in which each tendency of our nature aims to assert for itself its proper field and object. The law which the logician lays down is this: Nothing may be believed which is not proved, or at least made probable, by objective facts. The law which the mind actually follows is this: Whatever the mind demands for the satisfaction of its subjective interests and tendencies may be assumed as real, in default of positive disproof.

But these considerations also refer only to the origin of belief. They show that there are two sources of belief: first, the objective study of facts; and second, the subjective interests and tendencies of the soul itself; but they do not decide their relative logical worth, which is the point in dispute. On this point, too, there is a very considerable agreement among thinkers. Beliefs of the second class must be rejected as wishes turned into assertions, or as hopes which have mistaken themselves for truths. Sentiment of no sort may be allowed to

influence us in deciding what to believe. There is still a difference, however, among those who hold this view, as to what the facts are upon which objective belief shall be based. Some hold that the moral and religious nature is a fact which points to God as its only adequate explanation. That the conscience seeks after God as its implication and support proves nothing. That religion necessarily implies an object, and falls into contradiction without it, also proves nothing. But the existence of the conscience and of religion demands an explanation; and this must finally be found in God. Others, however, will not allow such a suggestion until all the resources of the associational psychology have been exhausted; and as these are supposed to be inexhaustible, we may well believe that both conscience and religion have a much less august origin. Accordingly, they are unwilling to recognize any thing as a ground of belief except the data of the external senses. These give us the world of fact, of experiment, observation, and verification. Whatever can certainly be deduced from such facts is knowledge; whatever they make probable is rational belief. All that lies outside of these lines is fable, fiction, and falsehood.

The value of this dictum, unfortunately, depends upon the value of sensationalism in philosophy. It is then no first principle, but one arrived at through a long course of doubtful reasoning. Proved it certainly is not, and very many hold that it is not even made probable. But overlooking this scruple, it is a widely-accepted principle that the subjective value of a belief is no mark of truth whatever. Thus the Christian world-view is superior to all others in adaptation to our practical and ideal needs. The intellect, the conscience, the heart, and the will are all recognized, and a supreme object is set before them. Neither the individual nor society could ask for more than the fulfillment of the Christian ideal. But while this fact shows a subjective adaptation, it is no proof of an objective correspondence. Neither the pleasant, nor the agreeable, nor the useful, but truth only, is the object of study and the end of research. From this high inquiry all appeal to feeling and utility must be rigorously excluded, if we would preserve our mental integrity, and not debauch ourselves with sentiment. "We covet truth" should be our only motto; and in stern loyalty to that we must follow truth at whatever cost of comfort and

disenchantment. But while the critic cannot fail to be impressed with the rugged grandeur of this ideal, he must regret that it leaves us a little in doubt as to what this truth is which is to be followed at any cost, and also that it places us between the horns of a troublesome dilemma. A theist can hardly admit with safety that our minds have such a parallax with reality that their deepest tendencies and necessities have nothing corresponding to them in the world of fact. An immoral and godless universe is a conception which could not lie long on the human mind in general without producing pernicious results, either in the form of insubordination and violence, or in the form of listlessness, paralysis, and a gradual abandonment of moral ideals. What avails it to fight the universe? On the other hand, the opposite conceptions are full of blessing both for the individual and for society. If, now, this is no ground for believing them, we are under the disagreeable necessity of admitting that a true belief may be paralyzing and pernicious, while a false belief may be necessary to our best development. When this admission is joined with the oft-heard assurance that truth can do no harm, the annoyance becomes extreme. The atheist is scarcely less embarrassed by these facts, for his conception of truth is almost exclusively teleological. Truth is the adjustment of inner relations to outer relations. The true conception is that which gives us control of the fact; in brief, the true theory is the successful theory. It follows that the true theory of life is that which leads to the largest, fullest, and highest life. The universe has evolved an almost exclusively moral and religious conception of itself, and has elevated and purified this conception from age to age. Natural selection, whose special function it is to kill off unfit beliefs, has assiduously fostered the ethical and religious world-view. But while we are confidently expecting to hear this view proclaimed in the name of evolution as the highest truth of the universe, we are suddenly, and somewhat tartly, told that the utility of a doctrine is no ground for believing it; the logic is not the best, to be sure, but it is probably the best possible under the circumstances. Its teleological character is especially prominent, and so is its final cause.

We do not succeed very well in getting clear of subjective interests so long as we deal with religious belief; but perhaps

we may escape into the realm of pure objectivity by falling back on science. There we make no reference to God or utility, but simply inquire, What is true? This is a noble aim, and is quite intelligible so long as we deal only with detailed problems, and take the common sense theory of knowledge for granted; otherwise it is somewhat obscure. Probably the first answer would be, that the true is the real. Facts are true, and truth means fact without any addition of theory. A philosophical purist might complain of this language as inexact; but as the meaning is plain we let it pass, and ask, What is a fact? especially, What is a fact unmixed with theory? Common sense points at once to the world of things as facts, free from all subjective additions and distortions; but the sensationalist, the agnostic, the relativist, and the idealist open fire forthwith, and blow this claim to pieces. The only undistorted fact in this connection is our sensations. The transformation of these into a world of things is an enormous addition to the fact, and the logical right with which it is done is far from evident. That it is done instinctively only shows that it is natural to the mind to do it; it by no means justifies the performance. Besides, instincts belong to those subjective elements from which it is the special glory of logic to save us. Again, we might appeal to the unity of belief on this point, and to the agreement of experience; but the unity of belief only reveals the constitution of the mind, and the agreement of experience only points to consistency of action in the external ground of our sensations. Such a ground there must be, but no one can show that only a certain series of material things would be an adequate ground; indeed, the more we think of it the harder it is to accept such an explanation. If, now, we are bent on having only unconditional fact or unadulterated truth, it must consist in a description of our subjective states and the laws of their combination and succession. But this truth is too pure for use or circulation, and a certain amount of alloy must be added to make it serviceable. If we allow the current theory to stand we shall have to say, Those things are real or true which the mind, because of its sensational experience, instinctively affirms to exist, which is manifestly a *petitio principii*. But if the instinctive affirmations of the mind are accepted in default of proof in the field of sense-perception, there seems

to be no good reason why similar affirmations should be rejected in the field of morals and religion.

In fact, those who demand the rejection of all subjective interests as grounds of belief have rarely any adequate idea of the extent to which they enter into our mental life. They are supposed to underlie only our moral and religious beliefs, whereas they are equally prominent in our cognitive and speculative activity. We have just seen that our objects must be taken for granted. Nor are we content to take them as they are given; we forthwith proceed to work them over in the interests of cognition. We make, as a matter of course, such modifications and assumptions as are necessary to enable us to comprehend the facts as if facts were under obligation to be comprehensible. Reality, as it exists for common sense, is the totality of things existing and events occurring at any given moment. This is fact; this is truth. But it is so far from being august or sacred that it is hard to find any but a practical value for it. That the North Pole is buried in ice and snow, that oxygen and hydrogen unite to form water, that the Mississippi empties into the Gulf of Mexico—such truths of fact are insufferably stupid except as bearing upon action. It is quite impossible to comprehend that enthusiasm for truth and its sacredness which results in setting up such truths for worship. And the mind itself is not satisfied with any such reality. We find it totally unmanageable, and we proceed to transform it, and especially to interpret it. This transformation and interpretation constitute what we call science. In this way we seek to escape from the intolerable opacity and confusion of the real to the transparency and intelligibility of the ideal. And to do this we assume that this vast totality of things and events falls into fixed classes, subject to fixed laws and bound up into a rational system. Then "interpretation" begins, and presently our ideal construction passes for the real, while the actual data of experience are dismissed as phenomena or appearances; indeed, they will be very lucky if they are not stigmatized as downright delusions. But wherefore this distortion of experience, and with what logical right does it take place? The universal reign of law is a subjective postulate. The right to interpret is a pure assumption. We make very free with facts when we distort them out of all likeness to themselves in order

to gratify our desire to understand. Of course, the scientist tells us that the universality of the law is an axiom; but logic takes upon itself to examine axioms, and generally with the result of removing their axiomatic character altogether. The truth is, that all this is done in the interests of the cognitive faculty. It is not the outcome of a logical compulsion, but rather of an esthetic craving. We could not deal with the facts without the assumption of law, but what right have we to deal with them? We could not understand the facts without assuming an intelligible order, but what right have we to understand them? We could not interpret the facts without transforming the data of experience into something utterly unlike themselves, but what right have we to interpret them, especially by distortion? Why not take things as we find them, and be content? Here common sense will ask, in a half-dazed way, if it is not the nature of the mind to seek to comprehend? Of course it is; but that does not prove that it is the nature of the universe to be comprehensible. No one doubts what the nature of the mind is; the doubt concerns the nature of things. Since there is so great a parallax between the religious nature and the nature of things, why may there not be an equally great parallax between the cognitive nature and the nature of things? The desire to find the universe intelligible is as purely subjective as the desire to find it moral. The desire to comprehend is as subjective as the desire to worship. The comprehensible universe is as pure an assumption as the religious universe. Moreover, the actual universe, that is, the universe as it is given, is not comprehensible; it is that other, assumed, ideal universe which is really intelligible, and our understanding of the actual is through the ideal. It gives one, therefore, a pleasant start of surprise to find science set apart by itself as the only objective product of the mind, while every thing else is stigmatized as subjective and fictitious. It shows such infantile trust, and also such infantile development. For from a logical stand-point science is simply an idol of the tribe, a projection into the world of reality of the subjective interests and postulates of the cognitive faculty. The atoms and ethers and molecules of science are products of the same anthropomorphic tendency which has produced gods and ghosts. Just as the moral and religious universe is said to be a projection of the

moral and religious nature, so the scientific universe is a projection of the cognitive nature.

But here it may occur to us, that there is a great difference in the cases, in that the scientific universe is reached by reasoning, while the others are not. The claim, however, is hardly tenable. If by the universe is meant the cosmos, in the sense of a completed system or a rational totality of things, the claim is absurd. In this sense the universe is only our idea of unity applied to plurality, giving us the conception of a finished and rounded whole. It is primarily a subjective ideal, and no reasoning can demonstrate its objective existence. But if by universe is meant those things and forces behind phenomena, these are indeed reached by reasoning, but by reasoning based on assumptions. The laws of thought do not take us as far as we want to go. In objective reasoning the law of the sufficient reason is the positive principle of thinking. The law of identity and contradiction is merely regulative and negative. But that law, taken in its generality, permits no specific conclusions. Thus it tells us that our sensations must have some cause, but it does not tell us what that cause is. Again, it assures us that phenomena must have some ground, but in itself it gives no hint as to the nature of that ground. Indeed, the law does not even assure us that the sufficient reason is knowable; for the agnostic as well as the dogmatist affirms a sufficient reason. They differ only as to its knowability. To get any progress out of the law we must understand the sufficient reason to mean the satisfying reason. The sufficient reason in any given case is that state of things which, being assumed, would enable the mind to comprehend the facts; that is to say, the sufficient reason is one which satisfies the mental desire to interpret and comprehend. In testing theories, also, the same fact appears. At first adequacy to the facts seems to be the final test; but if we ask what we mean by adequacy to the facts, it turns out again that the mind is the real judge of adequacy, as it is the sole source of the demand for adequate explanation. The facts themselves do not need to be satisfied, for they are not dissatisfied. No more do they demand explanation; they are quite indifferent to being explained or not. In themselves they are simply facts and events upon which the mind seizes until it has satisfied its passion for explaining. That which is

necessary to its understanding of the facts the mind assumes to be necessary to the facts themselves. To be sure, next to the weather, scientific interpretations are about the most variable thing we have; but even supposing concord and finality reached, it is far enough from self-evident that the reason which satisfies us must be the real ground of the facts themselves. This law of the satisfying reason does not rest upon any logical necessity, but rather on our cognitive instincts and an unwillingness to be put to hopeless intellectual confusion. Indeed, in all concrete thinking the need of mental satisfaction is at once the source of movement and the test of truth. In all mental activity, beyond the lowest regard to physical needs, the aim of the mind is to make a place for itself or to satisfy itself, and when such satisfaction is reached, the mind assumes that it has reached the truth.

The notion of a universe essentially incogitable is rejected because it violates our cognitive instincts, and leaves thought without an object. The notion of an immoral universe is rejected because it makes our moral nature an absurdity. The notion of a godless universe is rejected because in that case all our interests, mental, moral, and religious, must soon or later sink down into ruin. And the opposite conceptions are maintained, not because of an idle wish, but because of our inability to escape utter mental, moral, and esthetic confusion without them. Primarily, these conceptions represent the conditions of our complete mental well-being, or the demands which our mental build prompts us to make upon the universe. As to their objective validity they are all on the same logical plane. Science, ethics, and religion are alike the outcome of our mental constitution. In all of these departments the mind appears with its subjective interests and postulates, and demands that reality shall recognize them; and in all alike reality recognizes them only imperfectly. Knowledge is a vanishing point in the indefinite unknown. The power, not ourselves, also makes for righteousness, but it is only a tendency, and has, apparently, many exceptions. Likewise, the God in whom we believe reveals himself to some extent in experience, but for the most part clouds and darkness are round about him. The assured conviction we have rests not upon a logical deduction from experience, but upon the optimistic assumption that the mind has

a right to itself, and is at home in the universe. It throws itself upon the universe, therefore, in the firm faith that what its nature prompts it to seek will, in one form or another, be given. This is, to be sure, an act of pure faith; but it is a faith upon which all mental, as well as all moral and religious, life depends. And in the lack of positive disproof, or of irreducible contradiction among its assumptions, the mind insists that they shall stand, not, indeed, as logical deductions, but as fundamental postulates of mental procedure.

The conclusion from all these facts must be, that the driving and directive force of the mind lies in its living interests, and not in the discursive faculty. The principles of mental movement are to be sought, not in logic, but in life. We find to our surprise that there is no department of belief into which subjective interests do not enter as controlling. Even those beliefs mentioned as belonging to the realm of probabilities rest finally on assumptions based on subjective interests. If, now, we are to allow these interests no voice in determining our beliefs and assumptions, we shall have to make a clean sweep of every thing beyond a description of our mental states in their co-existences and sequences. And to this the agnostic advises us. This, he says, has been his view all along. Our science, as well as our theology, is only a subjective dream, and has nothing in it. It is the last, and in some respects the fairest, of those anthropomorphic dreams of which the human mind has ever been so prolific. For immature minds, or for a certain stage of social development, it has doubtless been valuable, and even necessary; but the critical intellect in its stern devotion to truth fails not to see that science also must go. Of course it costs us many an exquisite pang—the deepest, indeed, of which our nature is capable—to give up the sweet scientific vision of an intelligible universe; but loyalty to truth is dearer still. This claim may be dismissed with a word. The human mind is not made for agnosticism. There have always been sporadic cases; generally, however, in connection with religion; but the general judgment has assigned them to the department of mental and moral pathology. Meanwhile, science has gone on developing its system of thought in serene indifference to the agnostic. And it will always be so. It is no longer a question whether we are to have a science or a religion, but only what

kind of science and religion we are to have. There is no more danger of the race permanently contenting itself with agnosticism, in either science or religion, than there is of its ceasing to perform the instinctive functions of practical life. Of all skeptical squalls, the practiced critic says what Athanasius said of the pagan renascence of his time, "It is a little cloud, and will pass over." Individuals will be injured during their prevalence, but in the history of the race they are too transitory for much notice. The faith in the universe which underlies our mental life was not called into existence by logic, and will not vanish because of the discovery that it has no foundation beyond itself. Theory after theory will vanish, but Sisyphus, in a hopeful spirit, will continue to upheave his stone.

But once more, and finally, the question recurs as to the logical value of these subjective interests. Do they prove any thing? The answer must be, that primarily they are not reasons for believing, but tendencies to believe. As such they are psychological facts rather than logical reasons, and as such they prove nothing. They become reasons only as we assume some theory of their origin. If we may assume a harmony between our nature and the nature of things, or if we assume a process of evolution such that our nature must develop into harmony with reality, or if we assume that God will take care of our faculties and their essential veracity, then these subjective interests become reasons for believing. It is plain, however, that these assumptions themselves depend on the fact to be established, the trustworthiness of our nature; and cannot, therefore, be both premise and conclusion. Our nature must finally be taken on trust. Its practical demands are not necessities of thought, but rather true *axiomata*, that is, things worthy to be believed. Their contradictories are not unthinkable, but only esthetically or ethically absurd. In the last analysis these *axiomata* have an ethical root. They rest upon the idea, not of what must be, but of what ought to be. They are accepted because of their practical value, or their unconditional worth. This basal faith rests upon nothing deeper than itself, and hence it cannot be argued. Both acceptance and rejection are finally acts of choice rather than reasoning. The dispute finally reduces to this: The believer assumes our nature to be true until it is proved to be false: the unbeliever regards it as possibly false until it is

proved to be true. So far as logic is concerned there is little to choose between them; but the former principle has the advantage that it justifies our mental procedure; while the latter brings the mind to a stand-still and to utter paralysis. Still, this is somewhat compensated by the fact that the doubt generally exhausts itself in the religious realm, and leaves the cognitive interests full play. This ingenious distribution of faith and unfaith is both interesting and instructive.

What, then, is the function of logic with regard to these practical postulates? Plainly not to prove them, but to bring them and their implications out into clear consciousness. These postulates themselves are not primarily known as such, but exist rather as confused tendencies than as clearly defined principles. Thus the scientific consciousness is a comparatively recent development, and its implications are very imperfectly understood. What is implied in the assumed possibility of objectively valid knowledge is a question rarely asked, and still more rarely answered. Hence many have fancied that materialism, or atheism, or fatalism, might furnish a basis for science, whereas any one of them would engulf science in skepticism. The ethical consciousness, in like manner, is rarely in full possession of itself; and consequently many ethical theories acquire currency which, developed into their consequences, would prove fatal to all ethics. The religious consciousness, also, is developed into self-possession only by a long mental labor and experience extending over centuries. Left to itself it may fail utterly of comprehending its own implications, and even lose itself in irreligious assumptions. In all of these fields, therefore, there is need of a critical faculty which shall have the regulative function of securing consistency in the development of our postulates, and of adjusting their inter-relations. In this process of inner development and adjustment, logic is equally the servant of cognition, of ethics, and of religion, while all alike are outgrowths and expressions of our subjective needs and tendencies as evoked by our total experience. It is in this sense of having many implications which can be unfolded in systematic statement that the ethical and religious consciousness may be spoken of as an independent source of truth.

But this raises the question whether the assumed validity of the cognitive impulse and postulates might not lead to a con-

tradiction of the religious impulse and postulates. In that case we should have a civil war of the faculties, and no logical standard of decision. The general assumption is, that in such a case the cognitive impulse must have the right of way; but this is only a prejudice of the speculative faculty. In the light of its history it might be claimed with much show of reason that the speculative faculty has only the practical function of serving the ethical and religious life, which alone has unconditional worth. But we need not resort to such heroic measures. Truth is one; and if the cognitive faculty were shut up to irreligious conclusions we should have to accept them. But this will never happen. For, first, such opposition must not be assumed until a final interpretation has been reached; and such an interpretation is rarely possible. Most of our theories are liable to be overturned at any time by the discovery of new facts which will not fit into the old formulas. This has happened times without number already, and may well happen again. In the next place, an analysis of the conditions of knowledge would show that they coincide with the conditions of ethics and religion; and on the other hand, a study of the conditions of religion would show that the religious ideal must include the cognitive and the ethical ideal. The three have a common root and parallel implications. They develop, therefore, in mutual support and complex interaction. Dry and irreligious interpretations are shattered by the floods of life and aspiration poured over them by the moral and religious nature. Simple and compendious mechanical explanations are set aside by perverse and obdurate facts outside of the mechanism. On the other hand, the religious nature has always needed to be instructed by both the intellect and the conscience. The fact that the religious ideal must always include the cognitive and the ethical ideal, constitutes the barrier against superstition and immorality in religion, and also against a weak good-naturedness in our thought of God.

This general nature of fundamental belief, as being an expression of the fundamental interests and tendencies of the soul, throws light on many peculiar problems in the psychology of belief. First of all, we can understand the barrenness of merely logical criticism. This rests on a misapprehension of the actual procedure of the mind, and the mind retaliates by

ignoring it. The apparent independence of logic of many of our beliefs becomes equally intelligible, as they are not born of reasoning, but of life. Again, we can understand the peculiar variations of belief to which all are subject. In a pessimistic state of mind, when the springs of life are low, the scientist despairs and becomes an agnostic. In a similar state of mind, the moralist cries out, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." The Christian, after a period of full assurance, falls into doubt even of the existence of God. All the arguments in each case remain what they were before; the trouble is with the inner spring of faith. Nor can faith be recovered by arguing; this will often rather deepen the unbelief. Cure can best be sought by leaving nature to reassert itself, or by seeking to strengthen the sentiment from which belief originally sprang. We can also see how belief can be a ground for praise, and unbelief for condemnation. Viewing them as logical deductions from formal premises, nothing could be more absurd than this; but in fact our beliefs represent, not our conclusions, but us. They reveal the drift of our sympathies and the tendencies of our nature. They reveal also the quality of our souls and the grade of our development. To confess satisfaction with a mechanical, or immoral, or godless universe is only an act of self-revelation. The greatness of our demands measures the greatness of our nature. Only smallest souls can live without high faith and lofty hopes. We can further understand how the claim could arise that religion is based on feeling or on some special faculty. The moral and religious intensity which gives life to religious conviction is mistaken for a peculiar faculty. Last of all, we can see that any refinement, or purification, or elevation of human nature must lead to a corresponding change in our religious conceptions. Conversely, an era of low living will surely issue in a corresponding weakness of faith, and will spread its blight over the entire nature. The character of the mental soil determines the kind of crop.

This paper is written from a purely psychological stand-point. It does not affirm that the mind is able to develop a system of belief out of itself alone, independently of experience; it aims rather to call attention to the principles by which the mind works over its experience. The outcome is, that belief is a far

more complex thing than many are accustomed to think, and that any attempt to decide upon its validity by formal syllogistic processes is superficial and vain. It further follows, that the test of fundamental beliefs can never be any simple rule, but will rather be as complex as our nature itself. In determining what the mind demands, it is not enough to study individual psychology; for the individual is always a one-sided and incomplete specimen of the race. To eliminate these shortcomings the psychology of the race must be studied as revealed in institutions, in history, and in literature. On this broad field of the world beliefs meet and contend for the possession of the mind, not only nor mainly by argument, but by their manifold esthetic, ethical, and religious implications. More and more history itself becomes the argument, and the survival of the fittest the judge. What the mind demands in order to satisfy its own nature will be assumed so long as it is not disproved. But this principle is practical, not speculative. It does not assure us of the truth of the belief. Its falsehood involves no contradiction, but only an intolerable mental and moral confusion. And since it does not claim to be proved, it cannot be argued. It rests finally upon our faith that the universe has a meaning in it, and that the mind, with its aspirations and ideals, is at home. Allowing this faith, there is room for our highest devotion and most strenuous effort everywhere; denying it, the result is a deep and rayless pessimism in which intellect, will, conscience, and affection all lose their object, and are thrown back upon themselves to wither and perish.

ART. IV.—A PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF HAMLET.

A STUDENT of Shakespeare finds in Hamlet that his honored master and himself have unexpectedly come into novel relations. Still are they teacher and learner, but in a way different from heretofore. Shakespeare did not live to be an old man. But to his pupil, accustomed to a reverential posture at his feet, and habituated to watch, year by year, the fuller luster of the eye and to mark the deepening cadence of the voice, every sign by which time reveals the maturing mind is very distinctly

given in the drama of Hamlet. And wherein lies the change, and in what form does it express itself? Not in the mere conduct of the external movement, although that is strictly processional as to the progress of the idea and its final vindication. Nor is it in the slow ordering of the scenes so as to detain attention and complete each single stroke of impression. Nor, again, does this higher art of the dramatist disclose itself in the simultaneous interaction of thought and feeling, by which a twofold intensity is maintained in the reason and imagination. These are all Shakespearean, but not the special qualities of the advanced Shakespeare so luminously displayed in Hamlet. The characteristic of this drama is the number, variety, and compass of the tragic forces which embody their extreme activity, and by fated strength shape all circumstances in entire obedience to themselves. By the organic law governing every event accidents are excluded. Here, indeed, as nowhere else in Shakespeare, the omnipotence of providential rule is side by side with omnipresence; and if, according to his creed of art no less than of religion, a sparrow falls not to the ground without divine notice, he has employed his capacity to its utmost compass in the unfolding and enforcement of this unheeded truth as basic to all individualism and society. So far, therefore, as the scope and propensity of this sentiment are concerned, the dramatist in Hamlet reaches his most exalted attitude, and the student, if open to the inspiration of his master, is lifted into the highest realm of consciousness.

Accordingly, one finds the peculiarity of this drama taking its rise and pursuing its development in the very nature of Hamlet as a man. Much interest gathers about him as a young and injured prince. First and last, however, the royal personage is secondary. Though outwardly kept in close connection with his surroundings of palace and court, he is in reality detached by the breadth of infinite distance from their associations as to any determinative influence. The air of Elsinore and its castle is breathed, but another atmosphere arterializes his blood. Most of the time, Hamlet himself seems forgetful of the throne of Denmark and its honors as attractive to his ambition. Questions of his manhood absorb his mind, and his mode of dealing with them and the issues flowing therefrom are the fascination that holds us captive. The man alone—the

man in the secret turmoil of his soul, the man perplexed, bewildered, and overmastered in ceaseless struggles with his own unmanageable self—is the transcendent power that sways our feelings. This is heightened by the fact that Hamlet is essentially dramatic in his organization. Resting on a temperament of singular impressibility, his intellect, as to its inceptive stages of thought, is uncommonly acute to sensational influence. Nor, indeed, can he in subsequent moments of attenuated speculation rid himself of this original sensitiveness. The excited blood runs on into the furthest digression of reflectiveness. Not content with the images of the imagination as the ultimate outlet of sensation, the heated life-current swells in the "discourse of reason." A nervous shock meets no resistance; the vibrations, quick and strong, traverse the whole extent of his being, and there is not one non-conductor to arrest the electric circuit. Had he had the temptations of a moderate sensualist, this extreme inward force of sensation would have been drained off into other channels. But Hamlet had no leaning toward sensualism. Even the innocent forms of physical gratification were seemingly alien to his pure and noble nature. There is a strange absence in him of instinctive delight in the outward shows and pomps of material objects. Nor does he change in response to the variations of earth and sky, but he changes them into faithful reflexes of his own moods. Could he have enjoyed the free and exuberant naturalness of early existence? One is led to think of him as never having had a genuine childhood and youth, since the senses, instead of performing their double office of ingress and egress, are slavishly monopolized in the service of abstracted thinking. This disposition is not occasional, but habitual. It has all the force and constancy of an automatic energy. Looking at Hamlet in this primary aspect of his constitution, he is nothing less than a born dramatist, and, at the same time, a born actor, with a possible theater ready fitted up and lacking only a special equipment to suit the order of the performance. From the outset of life his nerves are theatrical, and it is only a matter of circumstances what form the play shall take. Dramatic the experience must be in the outworking of nature into character, for in such a man instinct can never translate itself into the language of active life except under conditions necessarily dramatizing.

Analyze this matter further and you discover that Hamlet had something else besides the weakness often found in conjunction with the literary temperament. Cicero and Erasmus, though very unlike men as to culture and position, are examples of the seductive influence of this temperament. The former, too good to be a politician in his evil day, and not strong and brave enough to be a statesman, gave to literature what should have been given to his country. Like the soft gray sky of Italy, that lends a deeper repose to its beautiful landscapes, it was his choice to be a spectacle for quiet admiration rather than to resemble the majestic forces typified in the mountain and the flood. Erasmus would have a reformation without the radical thoroughness of social regeneration. Not by thunder and lightning, but by mild disinfectants, the poisonous air of the world was to be purified. The literary temperament loves its ease, and, while it can forego many luxuries, the enjoyment of self-scrutiny is its supreme longing. If Milton were an exception to this common infirmity, it was because the sense of duty was the heroic element in his manhood. Now, in most cases, this temperament which I have called "literary" is not introversive; on the contrary, it is out-going. It loves an audience. It covets sympathy. Next to oratory, it has a yearning for recognition and hearty appreciation. The divine instinct of a fine thinker is, that it "is more blessed to give than to receive;" and in obedience thereto, a truly unselfish intellect delights to communicate for the sake of others. But in Hamlet this sort of temperament is not dominating. When he says that he is one "who can be bounded in a nutshell and count himself a kind of infinite space," he gives us more than an insight into his lack of ambition and his utter distaste for practical affairs. It is not so much the "king" as related to "infinite space," as the "king" mirrored in his enormous self-consciousness and the subject-object of his contemplation that captivates the overwrought sensibility. And hence his intellect, though so fertile in creation and luxuriant in expression, never concerns itself as to any fruit it might bear in others. As to being "a gem of purest ray serene" in the "dark unfathomed caves of ocean," or a "flower born to blush unseen," what poetic rhetoric could be more unmeaning to him! The "ray serene" is for his own eye, the "fragrance" for his

private breathing, and all the rest is "waste." This unvarying occupancy with self is not of the lower self. What he shall eat and drink, in what way kill time, how dispose of his large opportunities to find relief from oppressive care and solicitude, never engage his attention. Inward, still deeper inward, to-morrow more than to-day this searching for a remoter inwardness, year by year the steady expansion of a world contained in the soul and encircled by a horizon ever thinning away and hastening into ampler spaces: Hamlet is this fascinated explorer of life's occultness, seeking himself where the real Hamlet cannot be found, and only the shadow of his ideality, less tangible than the ghost of his father, can mock him with its evanescent communion. Account for these phenomena under any ordinary law of literary temperament, *plus* an abstract philosophic power of almost limitless activity? By no means; the temperament is an important question, perhaps more so than any other next to his genius; but the main thing is for the student to observe how this natural temperament was developed, by what steps it mastered the will and usurped the entire control of the mind, the direction it took in its abnormal energy, and the fatality it entailed first upon Hamlet and afterward on his career.

Seen in this light, Hamlet is a profound study in mental physiology. It is not the only aspect under which he may be considered, but it is one of peculiar interest just now, where so much scientific intellect is engaged in the investigation of the relations subsisting between mind and matter. It seems, in fact, that Shakespeare in his Hamlet anticipated much of our recent science, a fact the more remarkable since physiology was scarcely known in his day. Shakespeare does not teach physiology, but he involves it unawares to himself. Intent alone on his art, he unconsciously makes that art inclusive of a vast deal beyond itself, so that indeed the smallest of his services to humanity lies within the immediate precinct of dramatic poetry. The new Shakespeare of our day is rising into a genius, a character, an influence, and, we may add, an inspiration, far more commanding and ennobling than dramatic skill even in him could have secured. The study of Hamlet alone, in which the poet transcends the familiar limits of poetry, and allows himself the freedom of the universe, has produced its most signal effect in

our day altogether outside of its merit as a poetic achievement. Every one knows its value as poetry. But this is mere scaffolding; the magnificent fabric stands apart, and, as a structure of mind, taking its place among the architectural wonders of all ages, its grandeur is unchallenged. Hamlet in its embodiment of the organic principles of constructive art; Hamlet with its unity creating diversity, and, in turn, this rich diverseness falling back upon the unity for its enhancement; Hamlet with its tenacity of logic, wherein premises and conclusion, though extending in many lateral branches of sequence, yet hold firmly together; Hamlet as imparting to modern criticism the healthiest and freest impulse it has received; most of all, Hamlet as a study in intellectual philosophy, and in that branch of it involving psychology: may be regarded as significant of a new epoch of culture. That this study offers special advantages to the mental physiologist, is certainly very clear. At the start Hamlet's infirmity of will is well-defined. The growth of this morbid state, running through a succession of stages, is accurately presented. Nothing is omitted that can cast light on the progress of his intellectual besetment. Step by step the history discloses itself beneath the dramatized movements; the soul in its sorrow and strife is laid bare; and the unusual number, fullness, and impassioned fervor of the soliloquies make the self-revelation complete. More than anywhere else in Shakespeare, the life of the spirit and the life of the open world proceed on parallel lines, and we pass from the one to the other without a noticeable pause of transition. There is absolutely nothing to draw off attention from the principal character, every matter from the smallest to the greatest being as a multiplying mirror, in which the image is reproduced. And while there is not an occurrence which lacks dramatic interest, yet not an event happens that does not enter into the heart of the action and direct itself to the predestined end: the utter overthrow of all parties, innocent and guilty, Horatio excepted.

Called home from the University of Wittenberg by the death of his father, the king, Hamlet finds his uncle Claudius on the throne. His feelings are further shocked by his mother's marriage to Claudius so soon after his father's death. Here, then, are two classes of sensibilities—deep grief and vehement

indignation—and they are as opposite, nay, as antagonistic, as it is possible for emotions to be. One is reminded of Milton's figure of the "two black clouds" that come "rattling on over the Caspian, fraught with heaven's artillery," and then "join their dark encounter in mid-air." The grief is deep and tender, the indignation violent and irrepressible; and, the crown lost, what sphere of action has the young prince, what duties can engage him, that may serve as safety-valves for the escape of feelings not only excessive but conflicting? Within himself the overburdened heart is pent up, and the twofold anguish is increased by the suspicion of foul play. And what resort has he? The one least adapted to afford him relief, the one most likely to intensify the raging conflict; and, accordingly, he utters his soul in a soliloquy that rehearses "the uses of this world" as "weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable," closing with the words:

> "It is not, nor it cannot come to, good;
> But break, my heart, for I must hold my tongue."

Judging by Hamlet's temperament, either of these causes, grief or anger, acting under the circumstances then existing, would have made a lasting impression on his nervous system. Thirty years old, he was at the precise age where reason and passion are active in adjusting themselves to each other. It is the momentous turning-point in this part of our history, and consequently involves the relations subsisting between the nerves and the mind. We know that these relations are mysterious; and yet we also know that somewhere about that age the nerves take on their habits as activities co-ordinated with thought and impulse, while the mediating power of the imagination, the *nexus* between sense and spirit, is then as to its sensuous functions most energetic. The physical man having reached his growth, another and higher growth has now set in, the most important of all growths, by which soul and body become to each other helps or hinderances. At this critical time, Hamlet is subjected to the most wretched experience that the nerves can undergo by reason of the warfare of emotion. Grief tends to depress the nervous vigor, anger to excite it; grief works in the direction of passivity, anger toward resentful action; grief in its first moments deadens the imagination and interposes a check on its mitigating office, while anger

quickens its creative force. Now, in such a state, the steady operation of the nervous economy is impossible. Continuity of function is interrupted. The interruption of continuity wastes healthful strength, disturbs calmness, begets confusion, and shatters self-control. This was precisely Hamlet's condition at the initial point of the dramatic movement. The soliloquy that pours forth his excitement is thoroughly in accordance with physiological law. It is interjectional, abrupt, condensed, the rapid transitions of feeling not allowing time for any faculty to perfect its impression and give itself full utterance. Here, then, at the outset, is a drama of nerves, and before the outward order of the events has assumed shape, the tragic constituents are seen gathering on the arena within. The probable Hamlet presents his contour in lines sharply defined. The strength and the weakness, the hurried advance and the quick retreat, the logic of instinct balancing itself against the logic of intellect, the facile entrance of motives that neutralize one another's urgency—these all are here, and that, too, not only as prophecy, but as actuality. Strongest among them is the voice, a fearful tempter and deceiver to many who have little of Hamlet's genius, but to Hamlet himself the worst of betrayers, because always on the alert to suspend his sense of duty. If he can dramatize his sorrows in the play of accent and emphasis, it is enough. No man ever heard his own articulations with a pride so gratifying. A voice it was that disdained to listen for an echo from the world without; and just in the degree he delighted in its tones was he the hopeless victim of illusions. On the nervous side of his nature, a man is far gone in imbecility of will when his voice is to his ear the most satisfying of sounds; and this was exactly Hamlet's condition when his distress and indignation half appeased themselves by their facility of expression in language alike eloquent and argumentative.

In this state of extreme sensitiveness, the Ghost appears. To prepare the way for its introduction, and especially to put Hamlet in a proper frame of mind for an occasion so fraught with consequences, Horatio tells him that it had "started, like a guilty thing upon a fearful summons." Hamlet is forewarned of danger. The only being in the world capable of acting on Hamlet's mind renders him a most timely service. This specific

influence of Horatio, guarding Hamlet against the Ghost, takes permanent hold of Hamlet, so that in the after-discussions with himself, the "extravagant and erring spirit," that flies from the light and "hies to his confine," is never forgotten. His purpose fulfilled, the Ghost disappears. During the interview was Hamlet seemingly anxious that "I . . . may sweep to my revenge." Yes; but no sooner is the sensation past than the apparent resoluteness has gone. Sensations, as relative to the intellectual and emotional nature, are short-lived, and they obey this law so as to allow the sense-impression to become the sole property of the mind. Detached from the special senses, these perceptions, as the joint product of mind and body, are delivered over to the reflective, judging, and volitional processes, from which they pass to their appropriate spheres of life. The nerves concerned in these functions demand rest after exertion, and one of the elements of this rest is the dismissal of objects that have occupied attention. But Hamlet gives his thought no repose, and accordingly he is ever reproducing his sensations by means of the intellect. The method of nature is from sensation and perception to judgment and will and action; nerves are organized to do their work in this way. Hamlet's method was sensation, perception, reflection, and then back again into sensibility and sensation; nerves rebel against this tyranny and execute vengeance on their oppressor. This beautiful method of nature is further enforced by the law of moods. Inasmuch as monotony is deadening to the nerves, they are keenly susceptible to changes. There are no such watchful sentinels in the world; and many a breath gentler than a zephyr, and many a sound less audible than a whisper, report themselves in variations of idea and emotion. If nature finds us pulling too much or too long on any one of those delicate filaments that bind the threefold brain to the outer universe, she relaxes the grasp of the dangerous hand. This is what Hamlet would not, and finally could not, do. Too much in love with his power of thought, too little in love with himself, and still less sympathetic with those responsibilities which, in daily life, are the tests of truth and the measures of endeavor, he is a spendthrift of emotion, whose experience and career consist, for the most part, in vivid alternations of sensational nerves and prolific mental faculties. Is

it strange, then, that in the Ghost scene, marking the second period of the dramatic development, he should be so bent on revenge, and immediately thereafter lapse away into a purpose to feign madness? Given the man and his surroundings, the Ghost scene had brought him to a point at which some such resort as denaturalizing himself was inevitable. To counterfeit insanity was directly in his line of advance. Had he not already progressed to the verge of its achievement? One who has gone so far in self-surrender to the luxury of emotion can scarcely fail to go farther. This will allow the largest possible interplay between sensational nerves and disordered brains, and shut up here—a drama within a drama—what compass of liberty shall be out of reach for wisdom and wit, for ridicule and sarcasm, for scorn and denunciation, for the picturesque and the romantic, for the tenderness of pathos and the wildness of anguish!

This excessive nervous disturbance enabled Hamlet to play so well the part of an insane man. Much more than genius, and even genius in a dramatizing capacity of a high grade, was requisite for a task so unique. A peculiar experience that had fathomed the mid-ocean of life was needed. Add to these a knowledge of the more obscure forms of individuality and the labyrinthine windings through which individuality, when it enlarges into eccentricity, delights to wander; and then supplement them with a courageous persistency neither to be daunted by hazards, nor worn out by long-protracted exertions:—for just such efforts and risks Hamlet was fitted; and if his chosen drama succeeds for a time and defeats itself in the end, it was simply because Hamlet put his great abilities to a wrong and most pernicious use. To undertake the evasion of responsibility in this way, and trifle for years with manly duties, was to provoke that vengeance which only slumbers in moral laws while Providence holds them under the restraint of inactivity. Wake they must, when outraged nature bids them arise and vindicate the eternal order of righteousness! This stratagem of madness ruined Hamlet. Yet dramatically, it completely answered its purpose. It was a mask to those about him, but it unmasks him to us. We know him on this account more fully, and see very clearly into the intricacies of a character that otherwise would appear only as an enigma. The assumed

madness enabled Hamlet to be Hamlet in perfection, and he turned every opportunity to instant and most effective account. In a psychological point of view, the madness shows to what an extent the disordered state of his nervous system and the mental faculties had previously gone, and consequently it is little else than an exposition and commentary on Hamlet's previous history. There is not a new Hamlet, but the same Hamlet taking on larger dimensions. One or two scenes excepted—notably the one at Ophelia's grave—he keeps within the bounds of imitative art, and plays his role with consummate skill. The organic idea of the drama is not Hamlet's utter loss of self-control, such as occurs in real insanity, but an abused and perverted self-control, which runs to a fearful excess and grows upon him till it destroys him. And the final overthrow dates back to the period of return from the university. At that early day he began to break the divinely instituted connection between mind and body. On the first rupture, intellectual and moral death set in. The law of life, as shared by nerves and sensibility of soul, is that emotion shall find an outlet in action. Hamlet violated this law, and the punishment therefor was a disabled will. Another law, common to mind and body, limits our attention to those functions which are not furnished with self-guidance. Concentrate attention on any portion of mind or body not legitimate to its activity, and a disturbing element is introduced. Continue it, and the disorder is heightened. Hamlet was absorbed by self-consciousness. Hour by hour, month by month, his eye was fixed on himself and his experiences. This fixedness of attention on every sensation and susceptibility increased his irritableness, fed his morbid proclivity, and made him a prey to illusions. From the opening of his career to its close, Hamlet is a striking instance of exaggerated nervous action—a subject of an overmastering hysteria. Nor may we by any means agree with the learned men who regard Hamlet as insane. He had none of the "stuff" out of which insane men are made. Intense as his feelings were, they had a vent in the marvelous workings of his creative genius, and it would seem this vent saved him from downright insanity. And this view of the case should be the more insisted upon, since in our day there is rather a tendency to be insane on the subject of insanity.

But this aside. There is the great tragedy—a growing wonder in this cultivated age. In certain features of interest, in several aspects attractive to critical thought, men compare it with other tragedies, and especially with Shakespeare's own productions. These comparisons hold good only in the minor qualities of the play. Whatever is distinctive in Hamlet escapes this favorite method of scholarly examination, and secures a place for itself where parallelisms and contrasts have no significance. The highest greatness is not seen by setting it beside other forms of greatness, for this is the method of the senses, and not of insight. Greatness is essentially insulating. If one stands amazed before Mont Blanc, it is not because of its superiority to the neighboring Alps. Its grandeur is taken from the heavens above, not from the earth beneath; and the clouds that hang far below its summit are themselves exalted by being the apparel of its magnificence. Hamlet affects us most through original disclosures where our nature conceals itself by reason of its connections with infinity. The world is not Hamlet's trial. The questionings that ever recur and are never answered are self-questionings, and his most painful struggles are when he is farthest separated from society and most completely realizes himself. Other people throw him back upon his own perplexing nature, and the more he is in contact with associates, the more he is a paradox and enigma to his own spirit. And therefore the increasing hold that Hamlet has on this advancing age.

Among our most thoughtful men Hamlet has the position of tragic supremacy, because he is the exponent of so much in this century. Civilization is externally so splendid that it forces many to seek refuge in themselves, and our wise men, grown old, are writing their "Ecclesiastes." A deep and genuine sympathy, not born of esthetic art, but of our noblest instincts, draws us to this tragedy, which contains in itself all the profounder elements of human life, and speaks a language never heard save where the solemnity of our confused and troubled probation rests on the soul with its immortal meanings. Hamlet is a warning to one of the chief sins of this age—the glorification of the human intellect and the ruthless sacrifice of the moral nature to its imperious demands. And if one would see how rare gifts and graces may wither into

nothingness—how the best in us may become the worst, how the self-indulgence of even our higher nature will surely work its own punishment—he can find it all here in the most impressive personal form that tragedy ever assumed. Providence, as a spiritual power reigning over man, is never so awful as when it manifests itself in those finely endowed characters that have wrenched themselves away from their true relations to life and duty. And thus it is that Hamlet, the fitful and wayward Hamlet, regretful without heartfelt repentance, spasmodic not from weakness but from surplusage of undisciplined strength—thus it is that this majestic soul becomes a transparency through which Providence adapts its revelations to the vision of men. No such lesson in "vanity of vanities" has been taught since Solomon heaped around him the treasures of the whole earth only to impoverish his soul.

Nor are these the only instructions brought home to our hearts. Those human ties which are most human are concealed far down beneath the surface of our being. The tiny nervous filaments, distributed through the tissues of the organs, are invisible to the naked eye, and when combined they extend as cords to every part of the body. But we have ties that elude the scrutiny of consciousness, and our greatest influences do their work in hidden ways. Threads that reach the farthest and bind distant results most closely to our souls are often too delicate for even our observation. And so it is that we repeat ourselves in shapes and aspects least expected, and the mystery of the life within is deepened evermore by the mystery of the life without. As the procession of events moves forward in Hamlet, the shadow of what men call fate thickens in gloom. Polonius, worthy of a better destiny, is the first to perish. Rosencrantz and Guildenstern, "my two school-fellows" who "bear the mandate," are the men who "marshal" Hamlet to "knavery," and in the trial of craft against craft they are destroyed. Ophelia, so unconsciously trustful, so firmly obedient, beautiful, too, in the strength and tenacity of her affections, passes from love and hope to disappointment and grief, then to madness, then to death. At her grave, where pathos and self-reproach and anguish rush with startling vehemence over his spirit, reason gives way, while the phantom of recollection cries out, "*This is I, Hamlet the Dane!*" The insanity is

temporary. Hamlet recovers himself, and shows his intellectual acumen in perfection when narrating to Horatio the incidents of the sea-voyage and reasoning with Laertes to convince him that he is "of the faction that is wronged." But life is exhausted now. "Fortune's finger" has sounded all the stops she pleased; there remains naught but the dirge; and that dirge is over Claudius, Gertrude, Laertes, and Hamlet, lying together in death.

ART. V.—THE POPES AT AVIGNON.

ON the banks of the Rhone, some fifty miles north of Marseilles, lies a very ancient and now decayed city whose long existence is densely packed with history. Its modern name, Avignon, comes naturally from Avenio, under which name it is described by the Roman historians. Its soil was, however, probably trod by Grecian feet five hundred years before Christ. After the Romans, it passed under the dominion of the Goths, and then of the Saracens, who were expelled from it by Charles Martel. After centuries of possession by Provençal counts it was sold in 1348 by the Countess of Provence, afterward Queen Joanna of Naples, to Pope Clement VI. for fifty thousand florins, a part of the price being that he should declare her innocent of the murder of her husband, of which she was generally believed to be guilty. It continued in papal hands till the revolution of 1791.

The city stands in one of the finest districts of France. From a rocky tower in the garden Rocher des Dons the prospect is one of the most beautiful in all Europe. The majestic Rhone flows at your feet. The blue line of the Cevennes skirts the north-west. Far across the plain toward the north-east lies Mount Ventoux, while farther southward in the dim distance are the Alps, and nearer the silver thread of the Durance winds along to its union with the Rhone. With all its beauty it was plagued with winds, and "*Avenio ventosa, sine vento venenosa, cum vento fastidiosa*" has passed as a proverb into its history. The city is still surrounded by its lofty mediæval walls, with their towers and battlements and

handsome gates, while round the ramparts runs a shady boulevard.

On the rocky eminence that overlooks the river and commands the city stands the cathedral called Notre Dame des Dons, founded originally on the site of a heathen temple, and after its destruction by the Goths rebuilt by Charlemagne. Near by is what was once the palace of the popes, now a barrack and a prison. It is a huge, irregular Gothic structure, with high, thick, gloomy walls, built piecemeal at long intervals by successive pontiffs. Its towers and chambers were in the fourteenth century the home of the Inquisition, and they still contain the atrocious implements with which it tortured the bodies of its victims. Those grim, solid walls could be at the same time the *fête* place of Petrarch, the poet-laureate of the age, and the prison-house of Rienzi, the last of the tribunes. These edifices, with one or two others of lesser note grouped with them, were the ecclesiastical heart of the city which Petrarch and other Italian historians called the Babylon of the papal Church. The years of the papal residence there were called the period of "Babylonish captivity." This period extends from 1305 to 1378, a little more than seventy years.

The dawn of the fourteenth century began a new era in the history of European governments. Theocratic institutions had reached the height of their arrogant assumption of power, and modern royalty then achieved its first victory. The bold theories of Gregory VII., which for more than two centuries had made the necks of kings the pavement for papal feet, and their thrones the playthings of papal caprice, had found at last in Philip the Fair of France a king to defy them. Boniface VIII., a true successor of Gregory and the Innocents, had made a desperate struggle to establish more firmly the shaking throne of St. Peter. But the ignominy and insult of his last days, his fearful death, and the probable poisoning of his successor, showed that popular sentiment no longer regarded the person of the pope as sacred nor his authority as supreme. In the leading States of Europe, after the long dark ages of faction and disintegration—after the successive attempts at the imperial, aristocratic, republican, and mixed forms of royalty—there had at last emerged the essential idea of the twofold nature of nations, a government and a people. This idea had found

embodiment in powerful leaders. The Plantagenets had been its champions, and Edward III. was soon to surpass them all. Bannockburn and Crecy were its battle-fields. The last kings of the Capetian dynasty were to transmit it greatly strengthened to the house of Valois. Charles IV., with his Golden Bull, was its fitting representative in Germany. Margaret, the Semiramis of the North, was to make it the policy of Sweden and Denmark at the close of the century. Switzerland had known her William Tell, and Spain was to see the culmination of royalty in Charles V. It was the development of this principle that had secularized the nations. It was the deadly enemy of ecclesiastical assumption and tyranny. And though the tide of the battle had changed, yet it was around the banners of the Church that the blood of the people was still to flow, the strategy of generals was to find its field, and the keenest diplomacy of cardinals and statesmen was to match its powers.

This antagonism of Church and State was accompanied, perhaps largely caused, by the effort of the human mind to assert itself—to cease its worm-like crawling and put on wings. Philosophy, literature, law, religion, began to be fields in which the mind claimed its right to independent thought without the shackles of ecclesiastical supervision. Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus had led the way in the realm of scholastic philosophy. Gower and Chaucer had laid the foundation of English literature. Before the close of the fourteenth century Wiclif was to throw, as a firebrand among tinder-like combustibles, his English Bible into the excited thought of the age. Dante was just singing his divine songs in Italy and giving shape to her language. Petrarch and Boccaccio soon followed, the former a prominent actor in the arena of that Avignon he so aptly termed the Babylon of the Church.

The tide of papal supremacy had at last reached its height, and therein lay one of the mightiest of those crises that determine human affairs. The climbing aspirations of the human spirit came at length to a final pinnacle. That summit in the case of the papacy was gained when, at the jubilee of A.D. 1300, Boniface VIII., seated on the throne of Constantine in military garb, girded with a sword, a crown upon his head and a scepter in his hand, shouted to the assembled myriads before him, "I am Cæsar—I am Emperor." Little by little, from local and

humble supervision over the spiritual interests of men, the papal authority had crept on till its claim embraced all human interests in all Christendom. Long years it had been content that the spiritual and the secular should move side by side in complete accord in the government of the world. But dualism in headship is always a monstrosity. There may be harmony for a season, but soon or later headship means unity. All save one must become subordinate. And so at last the spiritual locked the temporal in its invisible fetters. The pope was the sole representative on earth of the Deity, and from him, therefore, must kings derive their power, and the temporal must be the slave instead of the sister of the spiritual. There must be a presiding power that should oversee the secular concerns of the nations, hold kings and emperors as their hereditary agents, be umpire in strifes, the source of international law, the judge in all causes, and the enforcer of its own sentences. Many conditions and powers helped the claim of the popes. Their office was sacred. They controlled the terrible weapons of excommunication and interdict. Their position was supposed to lift them above personal interest and narrowing jealousies. But experience had proved that the holiest office could be polluted by the lust and passions of the holder, and that the corruption of the best is always the worst.

And so the tide turned. But it must go out as it came in. No earthquake convulsions to swallow up the waters on the instant, but first a decided check, and then the slow, fierce struggle until the final ebb. Philip the Fair was the rocky barrier against which the highest tide dashed in vain. It was he that fulfilled the closing part of the famous prophecy concerning Boniface VIII., that he should enter like a fox, reign like a lion, and die like a dog. The tide turned with Boniface; but the slime it had deposited, and the foul relics of its recession, are more clearly visible in the period of the "Babylonish captivity."

Seven pontiffs sat on the throne of St. Peter during this portion of papal history. The first of these, Clement V., had consented to the degradation of the tiara that he might win it. The crown of Boniface, the disposer of secular crowns and the lord of all realms in its lofty claims, after a brief glitter on the head of Benedict XI. had tumbled to the feet of Philip the

Fair, whence Clement had humbled himself to pick it up. Philip had been able to dictate his own conditions. Those conditions completely reconciled him to the Church that had so lately denounced and deposed him; absolved all his agents in the struggle with Boniface; gave him for five years the tenths from the clergy of the realm; condemned the memory of Boniface; reinstated the Colonnas in the rank and honors of the cardinalate; and gave him the privilege of demanding whatever one thing the secret future should make desirable. That Clement should be willing to accept the papal scepter on such terms, and wield it under the eye and in the dominions of Philip, reveals at once the meanness of his nature and the tremendous force of that royal blow which could so stagger and stun the papal power. Those who judge the character of Clement most charitably declare that the Holy Ghost could have had nothing to do with an election to office so marked by human policy and deceit, and that his avarice and ambition knew no bounds. He died shamefully rich, though he had lived shamefully prodigal. It was generally believed that the beautiful Countess of Perigord was his mistress, who gratified his lusts that she might revel in his wealth and wield his power. Villani charges him with resorting to magic that he might ascertain what had become of the departed soul of one of his nephews. Dante places him in hell. His burial was ignoble; and though the subsequent piety of the Church gave him a silver coffin and an alabaster monument, yet his evil fame led the disciples of Calvin two hundred years later to plunder his tomb and burn his remains.

John XXII. was the son of a cobbler. For more than two years the papal see had been vacant. The impatience of Christendom at length convened the conclave at Lyons. After forty days of vain wrangling they agreed to elect whom the bishop of Porto should nominate. He was equal to so fortunate an occasion, and coolly nominated himself. Others say that the gold of the king of Naples had bribed the Italian cardinals to vote for the bishop, but only on condition that Rome should be the papal seat. He promised upon oath never to mount a horse or a mule, but in order to go to Rome. After his coronation at Lyons, to avoid a breach of his oath, the Rhone became his steed as far as Avignon, where he walked from the

water-side to the palace, and never stirred from it for the eighteen years of his pontificate. The popedom thus won by hypocrisy and meanness was held with arrogance and cruelty. John, though a man of profound learning, indorsed the current belief of the age in sorcery and magic. He provided against arts of magic by the virtue of a serpentine ring lent to him by Margaret, countess of Foix. And when neither this nor the sanctity of his person prevented a conspiracy against his life, his cruel disposition appears in the punishment of the bishop who was charged with using diabolic arts against him. The unfortunate man was flayed alive and torn asunder by four horses. Cruel persecutions were also instituted against various forms of heresy. The last argument for orthodoxy was the torture and the stake. The avarice of John far exceeded that of his predecessor. He devised new methods continually to increase his wealth. Among them was the annates, by which every clergyman appointed to a benefice was obliged to pay the pope one year's income before taking possession of it. By this and other means, notwithstanding his luxurious prodigality, he left at his death 18,000,000 florins of gold in coined money and 7,000,000 in ingots, jewels, and other valuables. The edict of Louis of Bavaria declared that by his scandalous life and enormous wickedness he had forfeited every ecclesiastical dignity. John had excommunicated Louis for leaguing with the Ghibellines to secure the imperial throne; but the status of royalty at this time, as against popery, was well illustrated by the subsequent crowning of Louis at Rome by two excommunicated bishops amid the acclamations of the people. For heresy and treason he formally deposed Pope John, and cashiered him from his papal office. On Ascension Day he took his seat in the Piazza of St. Peter's on an imperial throne, and, amid the glitter and pomp of court and clergy, formally decreed Peter di Corvari the true Roman pope, put on his finger the ring of St. Peter, arrayed him in the pall, and saluted him by the name of Nicholas V. The emperor, the anti-pope, and the Ghibellines were for the time triumphant. It is worthy of notice that the pet dogma of John—the sleep of the soul at death with no waking till the resurrection—found no sympathy either in the current theology or in popular sentiment. He was obliged to retract, and the heated disputes,

with the chagrin of defeat, were among the embitterments of his last days.

By a whimsical compromise, and an unexpected vote, the college of cardinals elected Benedict XII. as the successor of John XXII. When he found himself suddenly raised to a dignity to which he had never thought of aspiring, he told the cardinals that they had elected an ass for their pope. His administrative virtues are conceded to have been a rebuke to the vices of his predecessors. But his private character, if any credit may be given to his enemies, was far from faultless. The epitaph that described him as "a Nero, death to the laity, a viper to the clergy, without truth, a mere cup of wine," may have been too bitter an exaggeration. The current proverb, "as drunk as a pope," owed to him its origin and illustration. He is said to have seduced and kept as a concubine a sister of Petrarch. Probably such accusations have only too much foundation.

Whatever is believed concerning the character of Benedict, the corruption of his successor, Clement VI., can hardly be disputed. The court of Avignon became at once the gayest and most luxurious in Europe. The apostolic coffers seemed inexhaustible. Preferment was bestowed with lavish hand without regard to qualifications or character. His own relations received a liberal share. The papal palace was made one of the most magnificent structures in the world. Art adorned its spacious halls and learning graced it. The pope was more royal in his attire and more splendid in receptions, banquets, studs of horses, and gorgeous displays than the kings and emperors who paid him court. He took great delight in the company of women, and neither checked nor disguised his amorous disposition. The Countess of Turenne, beautiful, ambitious, and shameless, seemed to surpass all others in his affections, and to obtain the most of his favors. His luxurious and licentious example gave free sanction to the monstrous corruption of the city and was the disgrace and curse of his age.

Innocent VI. commenced his career as pope by falsifying the solemn oath that secured his election. That oath related to a statute which, if observed, would have made the cardinalate superior to the pontificate in its independence and privilege. As cardinal he had sworn to the statute; as pope he

declared it null and illegal. He had no scruple to resort to the cruelties of the Inquisition to subdue heresy. But in spite of perjury and cruelty he was a great improvement on his predecessor. He is termed by the historian of Latin Christianity the most powerful and most prudent of the Avignonese pontiffs. A splendid tomb just across the Rhone at Villeneuve still remains to mark his resting-place.

It would be an interesting investigation to inquire how far the visitations of God in great public calamities are reformatory. And as a special case in point, it would be interesting to know how much the black plague of these years had to do with the elevation of moral tone both in clergy and laity. This terrible plague broke out in Europe in 1348. It lasted through the popedom of Clement VI., and raged fearfully at Avignon in 1361 while Innocent was in the papal chair. In some places it carried off two thirds of the inhabitants; in others, it left only a twentieth part. At Avignon five cardinals and a hundred bishops died of it in three months. The cemeteries were all filled and multitudes of the dead lay unburied. Priests deserted their parishes, and princes their palaces. Only the mendicant friars cared for the sick or shrouded the dead. The Flagellantes, with a cross in one hand and a whip of knotted thongs in the other, scourged their bare shoulders through the highways and streets, bewailing their sins. Amid all this woe and suffering and walking in the face of death, it might be supposed that men of all ranks would halt in their paths of crime and vice, and fear the retributions of another world. Doubtless with some it had such an effect. But many plunged more desperately into debauchery, and many more made the miseries of others the occasion and the means of their own profit. Religion seldom finds a permanent revival as the result of great calamities. The pious only are made more pious by affliction. Floods and plagues and great national troubles may alarm and destroy, but piety born of terror dies young. The wicked pass on and are punished.

Urban V. was elected pope on the 28th of October, 1362. The value of papal bulls and absolutions in that age is well illustrated in the case of Barnabo Visconti, one of the most powerful of the Italian princes. He had declared himself

king, pope, and emperor in his own dominion. He had practiced monstrous cruelties upon the clergy; burned some alive in iron cages; bored their ears with hot irons; forced a priest to anathematize the pope and all his cardinals. For these and other crimes he had been over and over again excommunicated. But now by Urban he was absolved from all his sins on condition of giving up Bologna to the papal dominion with certain strongholds he had seized, and leaving the Guelphs in his own territories unmolested. Five hundred thousand florins of gold was the pope's dowry, also, on his reunion with the Church. Surely Urban understood the relation of politics and religion. But, alas for the waning power of the pope when such concessions were necessary! Still, against the personal character of Urban nothing is alleged. By the contemporary writers of his time he is regarded as among the best of the popes. He did much to discourage the avarice and licentiousness of the clergy, and much to promote learning and reward virtue. He made a show of removing the papal seat to Rome again and of reconciling the papacy to the empire. But the attractions of Avignon were too mighty, and he died there at last with the cross in his hand, on a couch before the altar of St. Peter, whither he had been carried to die in the sight of all the people.

Gregory XI. was the last of the Babylonian popes. Personally blameless in morals, his pontificate was passed in the midst of stormy conflicts, and was succeeded by the great schism that convulsed Latin Christendom, and threatened to make the Alps the boundary of a divided Church. His death at Rome, while his heart was at Avignon, typified the double succession to the papal crown which rent the Church for nearly forty years.

The character of the Babylonian popes fairly represents, probably, that of the inferior dignitaries of the Church as well as of the masses of the people. Benedict XII. was painted with his fist closed, because he was slow to confer Church preferments on men of gross moral character. Petrarch commended Gregory XI. for not following the example of his predecessor in bestowing benefices on none but those of great virtue, because in that case none would be conferred. How consistently he could bestow such a commendation we can well see

when we remember that he himself, with all the excellence of character ascribed to him, was the father of two illegitimate children. He is said to have been disgusted and intensely indignant at the dissipation and corruption of the city and court of Avignon. What, then, must have been the immorality around him if we estimate it in the light of his own? He speaks of the city as one vast brothel. Rome itself was, in comparison, the seat of matronly virtue.

The denunciation which Clement VI. delivered against the prelates as one of the last acts of his life, is emphatic testimony to their corruption. Said he:

> And if the friars were not to preach to the people, what would ye preach? Humility? You, the proudest, the most disdainful, the most magnificent among all the estates of men, who ride abroad in procession on your stately palfreys! Poverty? Ye who are so greedy, so obstinate in the pursuit of gain, that all the prebends and benefices of the world would not satiate your avidity! Chastity? Of this I say nothing! God knows your lives, how your bodies are pampered with pleasures! If you hate the begging friars and close your doors against them, it is that they may not see your lives; you had rather waste your breath on panders and ruffians than on mendicants!

One hundred years before, the bishop of Liege had publicly boasted that fourteen children had been born to him in the space of twenty-two months. Forty years after the death of Clement VI., Pope John XXIII. illustrated, as scarcely any other man had ever done, the depth of monstrous lust and cruelty to which a human being could go. The period of the "Babylonian captivity" was not better (perhaps not worse) in the moral character of both clergy and laity than the other centuries of mediæval Church history.

The Church of the Middle Ages was an ecclesiastical system which, under the forms of piety and religion, raised the hierarchy to marvelous power with its strong temptations to tyranny and luxury, while it degraded the masses of the laity by playing upon their fears and superstitions. It was a machine manipulated by the few for their own earthly aggrandizement at the expense of the souls of men. By it the most godlike element in man was cheated into the most servile obedience to human dogma, issued often by polluted and lying lips as a divine command. The Avignonese period was in the

center of this epoch. The papal chair had long been the prize of Machiavelian diplomacy, though claiming to be the gift of divine decision. It had assumed and exercised supremacy over kings and emperors as an essential function of its power. But the height of that power had been reached, and secular rulers now successfully questioned and resisted it. The popedom of Clement V. was the virtual gift of Philip the Fair. The giver was able to make his own conditions, and the receiver was willing to accept it at the stipulated price. He was a man of unbounded ambition and great duplicity. He owed all his preferments to Boniface. He was ready to sacrifice friendship, as well as gratitude, to his ambition. He was ready to accept the dictation of the secular power; to wear the triple crown stripped of some of its stars, rather than not have it at all. He was content that Christendom should have a new center, and that Rome should lose her dominion. The throne of St. Peter was transferred to French soil, and the bishop of Rome was only a French prelate. A French pope acknowledged a French king as his master. Such was the inauguration of the "captivity." The transition from the authority of Boniface to the subserviency of Clement was as complete a revolution as could well be conceived. And in it all was not one trace of pious purpose for the souls of men, but only the selfish grasping of worldly ambition, luxurious lust, and miserly avarice.

The character of the inferior clergy was not misrepresented in that of the head of the Church. The scramble for clerical holdings of every grade was intense, and shared by large numbers. Real love for the souls of men was a motive either altogether unknown or far in the background. The loaves and fishes were the real motive. The existing priesthood and the candidates for it were in their spirit largely the genuine descendants of the sons of Eli. Simony was the most common of crimes. The poor priest-ridden people were taxed to poverty to support their spiritual masters and advisers in hypocritical idleness; and, worse than all, examples of drunkenness and lust in those whom they were taught to reverence and imitate gave ample license to the lower classes of society. The moral status of Romish Christianity during the reign of the seven popes at Avignon could hardly have been worse.

The foreshadowing of that mighty Reformation which appeared two centuries later lay partially in this very characteristic of the papal Church. When the nadir should be reached it would be time for the reaction to begin. The forces which were to bring the Church to that lowest point of degradation were in mighty and rapid operation. When they seemed to carry it to the height of its prosperity they were really plunging it into the depths of ruin. Like the steeds of Phaethon, if held by a master they carried the chariot on the brilliant pathway of the sky; if guided by reckless ignorance they became unmanageable and wrecked the whole. The zenith became the nadir. Jerusalem changed to Babylon. The very elements which made the Church powerful made it also corrupt. Persecutions and martyrdoms were the fruitful stimulants of its growth. Power and wealth were the instruments that brought decay and death.

The clergy were a close corporation, independent of the laws of the State. A priest was amenable to no civil law. Whatever his crime, he must be tried by the members of his guild. And the clergy were made to include any body who could write his name or read even a sentence from a book. Whoever could give this proof of membership in the clerical body was entitled to benefit of clergy, and to be tried by his peers. The walls of a monastery were as complete a protection to the criminal as the Jewish cities of refuge. Not even the king could open their gates for the officers of the law. But on the other hand, the sanction of the Church was essential to every officer, from tithingman to king, and to the operation of every civil law. The decree of the Church could strip off even royal robes and annul the decision of any secular court. The clergy made laws for the laity and compelled their obedience. The laity made laws and the clergy disobeyed them with impunity. Such in brief was the relation of the Church to the State.

What was the religion of the people? It was summed up in the sentence, "Believe the priest and do his bidding." The popular religion was to the genuine religion of the Bible what the manikin is to the man. It was a lifeless machine with the priest at the crank. The more intelligent the priest the greater the hypocrite. He was an unbeliever in his own professions, and made gain of the credulity of others. At the very conse-

cration of the Eucharist he said in his heart, "Bread thou art, and bread thou shalt remain." The piety of the laity was simply ceremonial conformity. The rite of extreme unction was ample atonement for a corrupt life, and a rich fee as a death present secured exemption from purgatory. The morality of the people would, of course, correspond with their religion. The example of idle, sensual monks who swarmed every-where —of priests who did not scruple to invade the sanctities of domestic life—could not fail to penetrate the whole fabric of society. Every sin was easy because, however gross, a few mumbled words and a little money would make all clean again.

When Petrarch and the other Italian writers designated Avignon as Babylon, and this epoch of the Romish Church as the "Babylonish captivity," they used these terms in the whole breadth of their meaning. Babylon, in the Scriptures, is the antithesis of Jerusalem. As the latter is the type of the purity of heaven, so the former is the symbol of the abominations of hell. Petrarch, Dante, Boccaccio, and others, were not afraid even in their day to use the words in this application. Avignon was no mere receptacle of a deported papal throne and court, but it was the center of a corruption that overspread Christendom. It was the core of the Church's rottenness, whence spread far-flowing streams of filth and pollution. As a specimen of vigorous invective it would be difficult to find a more striking one than a letter from Petrarch to a confidential friend. He says:

I am at present in the western Babylon, than which the sun never beheld any thing more hideous, and beside the fierce Rhone, where the successors of the poor fishermen now live as kings. Here the credulous crowd of Christians are caught in the name of Jesus, but by the arts of Belial, and being stripped of their scales, are fried to fill the belly of gluttons. Go to India, or wherever you choose, but avoid Babylon if you do not wish to go down alive to hell. Whatever you have heard or read of as to perfidy and fraud, pride, incontinence and unbridled lust, impiety and wickedness of every kind, you will find here collected and heaped together. Rejoice, and glory in this, O Babylon, situated on the Rhone, that thou art the enemy of the good, the friend of the bad, the asylum of wild beasts, the whore that hast committed fornication with the kings of the earth! Thou art she whom the inspired evangelist saw in the Spirit; yes, thee,

and none but thee, he saw "sitting upon many waters." See thy dress—"A woman clothed in purple and scarlet." Dost thou know thyself, Babylon? Certainly what follows agrees to thee and none else—"Mother of fornications and abominations of the earth." But hear the rest—"I saw," says the evangelist, "a woman drunk with the blood of the saints, and the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Point out another to whom this is applicable but thee.

The Latin eclogues of Petrarch were full of the same satirical denunciation, and his sonnets in his own language still more openly characterized the holy see as the "school of error, the temple of heresy, the forge of fraud, the hell of the living." Yet Petrarch and his contemporaries, with all their eyes saw of its infamy, had no thought of renouncing the Romish communion! What philosophy shall explain this and kindred facts in the history of the Church in all ages?

The acme of papal power was reached in 1198 A. D., with the reign of Innocent III. From that time until the decease of Boniface VIII., fully a hundred years, the popes sat on the thrones of princes and the benches of judges as truly as in their legitimate spiritual seat at the head of the Church. The declension of their power began with Clement V., the first of the Babylonian popes, and has never ceased. No epochs of its history were more disastrous than the seventy years of the "captivity" and the forty of the great schism which grew directly out of it. Then came the authority of councils, and then the Reformation. From that day popery was doomed, though the throes of its death-struggles have been long and bloody.

The forces that wrought against it can easily be traced. One important enemy was its own obesity. It was not only too plethoric for locomotion, but it was too heavily loaded for its frame-work. It must collapse by its own weight. Vaulting ambition overreaches itself. The treasure-house bursts under the pressure of its contents. The tightening grasp of tyranny at last tortures the sufferer into self-defense. The subtle influences of unbounded prosperity transforms him who should be the holiest of men into the wickedest, and the simple truths of the Gospel into the iron machinery of terrible oppression.

Nationality was asserting itself. That idea was naturally

hostile to papal claims. If a nation was a separate entity, and not a limb of the papal body; if it had an inherent individuality and an independent mission, then the claim of the Church was a usurpation to be resisted. The sphere of the Church was essentially and unchangeably different from that of the State. No monkish incantation nor priestly magic could transform the chair of St. Peter into a secular seat. It was not consistent with the spiritual functions of the head of the Church to lay taxes, receive revenues, raise and manage armies, enact and enforce civil laws, and, in a word, hold the reins of State in his own hand. All this must be done by proxy and by an influence exerted from without. The vicar of Christ must somehow persuade kings and princes that they were ordained of God to be the ministers of the Church, and the executors of his will through its earthly head. When, therefore, rulers and nations broke loose from that theory it would be fatal to the continuance of secular power in the Church. Just this happened.

Philip the Fair, though more as an individual than as the head of a nation, began the fight, and Boniface VIII. found himself unhorsed in the terrible tilt. The house of Valois took up the glove, and France rapidly rose to national independence. England and Germany were not slow to take the same position. Various incidents in the history of minor princes also show that the disposition to defy the claims of the pope was abroad. "Dost thou know, thou old fornicator," said Barnabo Visconti, lord of Milan, "that I am king, pope, and emperor in my own dominions; that the pope has no power over me nor any of my subjects?" Louis of Bavaria declared the pope's absolution of the vassals of the empire from their oaths "a wicked procuration of perjury; the act, not of a vicar of Christ, but of a cruel and lawless tyrant."

Language and literature were beginning their noiseless yet mighty warfare against ecclesiastical despotism. Learning and religion became restive in the too narrow drapery of the Latin language. New tongues began to take shape and embody living thoughts. Men might pray possibly, it began to be thought, in some other than a dead language. Ceremonial and court language might be other than the Latin. Greek put on its resurrection robe. Learning revived. All this

struck heavily at obsolete and antique forms, smitten already with the symptoms of decay. Moreover, many writers appeared who turned their invective either in satire or denunciation with the utmost bitterness and directness against the crimes and licentiousness of the clergy. Such were the "Facetiæ" of Poggio, the "Speculum Stultorum" of Nigel Wircker, and nearer the Reformation the "Praise of Folly," by Erasmus. Burchiello, Pulci, Franco, Walter Mapes, Hemmerlein, Brandt, and others, wrote works that told terribly on the vices of those who "divided their hours between the chapel, the pot-house, and the brothel." William of Occam and John Wiclif in quite another way made learning the agent of reform. The one by his philosophy, and the other by his translation of the Bible, made great havoc with the pretensions of the Church. With all these enemies of popery put also the general awakening of the human mind to independent thought on all subjects, the activity of the spirit of investigation and discovery, the invention of printing, and the general quickening of individual human life, and you have the main causes which wrought the downfall of the papal throne.

One of the most important of the institutions of the papacy beginning with this epoch and continuing for centuries, was the so-called jubilee. It was an agency of great power and profit to the popes, strikingly illustrative of their ingenuity, as well as the credulity of believers. But it also led the way to that gross and wholesale issuing of indulgences that did so much to inaugurate the Reformation. The first of these jubilees was celebrated just before the "captivity" in accordance with a bull of Boniface, founded on slight historical basis, but some traditional testimony. A Church historian had asserted that in the last year of the 12th century not only Romans, but foreigners, had flocked to St. Peter's Church to gain the indulgences which they had been told were to be had in the last year of every century. An old native of Savoy, one hundred and seven years of age, declared to Boniface that he was there with his father one hundred years before, and that the city was crowded with those seeking indulgences. Other old men corroborated these stories on the testimony of their fathers and grandfathers. Boniface saw his opportunity and resolved to confirm the solemnity forever. He issued a bull granting full

remission of all sins to all who in the current year, beginning and ending with Christmas, and every one hundreth thereafter, should visit the Basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul, provided they sincerely repented of these sins and confessed them. Romans must visit the two churches once a day for thirty days, and strangers for fifteen. John Villani visited Rome on this occasion, and assures us that two hundred thousand strangers were in the city during the year, and that they were all supplied with provisions at reasonable rates. Immense sums of money were offered at the tombs of the two apostles. On the first day of the jubilee Boniface appeared in the gorgeous robes of the high pontiff and blessed the people. On the second he showed himself in the imperial mantle, two swords being carried before him by attendants crying, "Behold, here are two swords!" thus assuming the supreme temporal as well as spiritual power.

In 1343 Clement VI. changed the celebration of the jubilee from the one hundred to the fiftieth year, in imitation of the Jewish jubilee. In August, 1348, as the time drew near, he issued a special bull urging all throughout Christendom to avail themselves of this privilege, as it might be the last. Such crowds flocked to Rome, says Petrarch, that one would have thought that the plague which had almost unpeopled the earth had not so much as thinned it. On Passion Sunday, when the handkerchief of Veronica was shown, the crowd was so great that many were suffocated and died in the throng. Matthew Villani, an eye-witness, says that by the computation of the Romans the daily number in Rome from Christmas to Easter was one million to one million two hundred thousand; from Easter to Whitsunday, eight hundred thousand; and through all the excessive heats of summer in no day was there less than two hundred thousand. Meyer says that scarcely one in ten ever returned home, but died of fatigue and hunger. The Romans treated the pilgrims with great cruelty, and made the occasion their harvest for gain.

Urban VI. reduced the jubilee from every fiftieth to every thirty-third year, in memory of the duration of the Saviour's life on earth. During the whole of the year 1390 Rome was crowded with pilgrims from all countries and all ranks of society. But by special permission the kings and queens of

England and Portugal were allowed the same indulgences at home as others obtained by the journey. They must, however, pay the same sum as the journey would have cost them. After the year had expired the same privileges were extended to all who could not make the pilgrimage. Vast sums of money thus came into the papal coffers. The agents of the pope abused their powers, set up their indulgences to the highest bidders, absolved from any crime provided the money was forthcoming, and required no penitence nor restitution.

In 1450 the sixth jubilee was celebrated. The period was now reduced to twenty-five years by Paul II. and Sextus IV., and this is still the period for its celebration. It partially replaced the crusades as a moral force supporting the power of the pope, and led the way, perhaps, to that extensive and reckless sale of indulgences which was the immediate occasion of the Protestant Reformation.

The epoch of the Church we have now been discussing was followed by that of the great schism of the West. In 1378 Urban VI. took his papal seat on the Tiber, and Clement VII. his anti-papal seat on the Rhone. Of the one it was said: "None is so insolent as a low man suddenly raised to power;" of the other, that his name was the antithesis of his character. In Urban, his craft, treachery, and utter inhumanity seemed almost to confirm the charge of madness. In Clement, high birth, courage, and sagacity were a poor offset to his utter want of devotion, holiness, or mercy. For forty years pope and anti-pope glared at each other across the Alps, and Christendom, arrayed in rival battalions, angrily turned the Church into a battle-field of hellish strife, and the States of Europe into an arena of intrigue, hate, and blood. Each pope was most anxious to heal the schism, provided it could be done by the resignation of the other. Boniface, the successor of Urban, addressed Clement by the unconciliating title of Son of Belial; Clement in return threw the messengers of Boniface into prison. Cession, arbitration, a general council, were proposed to heal the breach. It was of no avail. The Rhone pope in his own palace suffered siege, capture, and five years' imprisonment. After his release he invited the principal burghers of Avignon to a feast, barred the doors upon them, and burned them alive. The Vatican pope was tossed on waves of blood.

Murder and pillage reddened the Tiber and blackened the Eternal City. At last came councils—Pisa, Constance, Basle—and a new assumption of power in conflict with papal rights. Then the deposition of both popes and the election of a third. Then at last in 1447 the election of Thomas of Sarzana as Nicholas V., and in 1449 the abdication of Pope Felix, and the Latin Church had once more a single head.

The popedom of Nicholas marks the culmination of this important epoch of the papacy. The dominion of Latin Christianity was drawing to a close, and the dawn of Teutonic Christianity was breaking. A century of such rule as was seen in the career of several of the popes between this period and the Reformation, with their nepotism, horrible cruelty and lust, wars, intrigues, and disasters, was enough. The cup was full, and the permanent division of Christendom was accomplished.

And yet it was during this last century of her power that the Latin Church conferred some of her richest benefits upon the world. Unconsciously, in these very benefits she drew a fatal sword upon herself. To throttle the philosophy of the schoolmen and to patronize the literature of the classics was to put a keen blade into the hands of her enemies. To entertain and introduce to men the poets, philosophers, and historians of Greece was to admit a conquering Cyrus through the channel of her own Euphrates into a self-complacent and secure Babylon. To pour upon the world the light of letters and the beauty of art; to plant her cathedrals, which in their grand silence forever preach a more refining Gospel than the mumbled rituals within, was to break the fetters of ignorance and superstition, and give birth to a power she could never again control.

Art. VI.—TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES.

The discovery and publication of an early patristic document, that was supposed to be entirely lost, and the further fact that this ancient treatise, on examination, proves to be of very considerable value, is an event of not a little interest, in these times of active and learned biblical research; and precisely this we have in the case of "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." Nine years ago—in 1875—Philotheos Briennios, then metropolitan of Serses in Mesopotamia, discovered in the Library of the Holy Sepulcher, in Constantinople, a manuscript volume of which almost nothing appears to have been before known, but which proved on examination to be of great value. It was written in cursive Greek, and is dated A. D. 1056; the scribe or copyist signs himself "Leon, copyist and sinner." The book is made up of 120 leaves or folios of parchment, and contains, first, "Chrysostom's Synopsis of the Books of the New and Old Testaments;" then the "Epistle of Barnabas;" next in order are two "Epistles of Clement;" then comes the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," occupying pages 76–80 of the manuscript, and this is followed by "Twelve Epistles of Ignatius"—the current seven, besides one to the Virgin Mary, and four others. The "find" was chiefly prized by the finder for its complete copies of the "Epistles of Clement," neither of which had been found entire in any of the known manuscripts; and these were soon after published, having been carefully edited by the discoverer. But the pages of the "Teaching" did not escape his notice, for he announced its discovery in his edition of the Clementine Epistles. The newfound book was examined by a number of eminent patristic scholars, but, as far as appears, without suspecting its real character. It is manifest that Bishop Briennios had no correct appreciation of the value of this portion of his discovery, for he said nothing about it when, in addition to the Clementine Epistles, he called public attention to the fact that the book contained the complete Greek text of Barnabas and the "Epistles of Ignatius," both of which he proposed to prepare for publication. Bishop Lightfoot seems to have very faintly suspected that there might be something worthy of attention in the

"Teaching," for in the appendix to his new edition of "St. Clement of Rome" he remarked in passing, while recognizing the great value of "the new Greek of Barnabas," that "what may be the value of the 'Doctrina Duodecim Apostolorum' remains to be seen." And what is still more strange, certain German scholars were engaged in restoring the lost book from fragments preserved in other works, while the complete manuscript, whose discovery had been made public, was disregarded. For eight years after its discovery the "Teaching" remained quietly in the hands of the good bishop, who, during that time, and apparently as a labor of love, carefully edited it, and then gave it to the public, "with an abundance of learned illustrations." This was done in 1883.

A book answering very fully to this is referred to by several of the early apostolic fathers, and, indeed, there can be no doubt of both its genuineness and its antiquity. It is cited by Clement of Alexandria, and Eusebius speaks of it in his History as *τῶν Ἀποστόλων οἱ λεγόμεναι διδαχαί*; and Athanasius names it in one of his epistles. Both the Apostolical Constitutions and the Apostolical Epitome were evidently in part drawn from this work. From these sources the attempt was made, by Krawatzky and others, to reconstruct the lost document, with most remarkable success, as is seen by comparing their work with the original. A catalogue of the books of the Scriptures, canonical and uncanonical, attributed to Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, (A. D. 806–814,) includes among the latter the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," and it is placed between the "Gospel of Thomas" and the "Epistles of Clement." This is the latest reference anywhere found to the document. The "Teaching" probably belongs to the second century. Some would even place it in the last decade of the first, but about the middle of the second is its most probable date. Its whole tone is in harmony with the recognized writings of that time, and while it contains nothing which forbids its assignment to that date, its antiquity is corroborated by an abundance of collateral evidence.

In respect to its form and substance the "Teaching" appears to have been designed to serve as a manual to Christian converts and believers, and a directory for certain ordinary religious services. The first six chapters relate to moral duties. Then follow instructions respecting baptism, fasting, and

prayer, the eucharist, with forms of prayer and thanksgiving. After these are given somewhat definite instructions in respect to religious teachers; cautions against impostors and pretenders; exhortations to duly reverence the genuine; the Lord's day services; directions respecting the appointment and the treatment of bishops and deacons; of brotherly love and duty, and of personal devotion and watchfulness—the whole made the more impressive by a reference to Christ's expected coming "in the clouds of heaven, and all his saints with him."

In tone and style the tractate is Petrine rather than Pauline; Judaistic or Syrian rather than Ephesian or Roman, and it has therefore been inferred that its place of origin must have been somewhere in the East, perhaps Antioch, or some other place in Northern Syria. Its forms of thought and its references and illustrations are distinctively Jewish; and yet there are manifestly purposed oppositions to certain Jewish opinions and practices—as when a difference respecting the fast-days is prescribed, or the "Lord's day" substituted for the Sabbath, as the time for the assembling for public worship. But, as with the Jews, the hours of prayer and the days for fasting are definitely prescribed. The ethical element has the first place; great emphasis is laid on certain observances—fasting, almsgiving, and forms of prayer. On the other hand, there is a notable absence of reference to the peculiar facts and doctrines of the Gospel; to the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, and the forgiveness of sin in virtue of his atoning sacrifice. In these things the "Teaching" is not unlike the Epistle of James, presenting chiefly the ethical and disciplinary side of religion. These things indicate that its locality must have been elsewhere than in Western Asia or Europe—the regions in which the specifically Pauline conceptions of Christianity prevailed.

Respecting the date of its composition the internal evidence agrees very well with the external, fixing it not later than the earlier part of the second century. The coincidences of both thought and language between it and both Hermas and Barnabas render it almost certain that either these quoted from that, or that from these; and it seems the more probable that the "Teaching" was the original. Certainly, ritualistic tendencies early manifested themselves in the Church; at first in

very small proportions, but steadily increasing in extent and exactness. Signs of the beginning of these things are clearly manifest in this tractate, which appear in the "Pastor of Hermas," and the "Epistle of Barnabas" still further developed. The Apostles' Creed, also, lies in this line of development, for while in the "Teaching" no confession of faith is prescribed to the candidate for baptism, the Creed, which must have been a somewhat later production, and which was required of candidates, is a rather comprehensive statement of Christian *credenda*. The Apostolical Constitutions, which belong to a still later time, carry the ritualistic prescription much further. As, therefore, the place of the preparation of this manual was pretty certainly somewhere toward the east of north-east of the Mediterranean Sea, so also its date very naturally falls within the first half of the second century.

The references to various classes or orders of Christian teachers and inchoate ecclesiastical arrangements indicate an existing transitional state of things. Not much is said about apostles, but evidently their place is supplied by the "prophets," who seem to have been a class of itinerant evangelists, with more or less authority according as they were or were not recognized as "true prophets." But clearly they could exercise only a moral and advisory authority in the Church; and even in that day the abuse of the "religious tramp" had become so large that each new-comer was required to prove his claims—to work for his own support, or to pass on. The local churches were becoming individualized, with the two cardinal conditions of self-government and self-support. There were "bishops," but these were manifestly of the same kind or order, as elders or presbyters; and there were "deacons," stewards of the temporalities, who, however, were expected to be like their predecessors at Jerusalem, "men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom;" but they were such as in the Church of our day would be styled laymen. The distinction of three orders in the ministry seems to have been as yet unknown; and as that began to appear scarcely earlier than the end of the second century, these things agree with the conclusion before reached as to the date of this writing.

The instructions respecting baptism, fasting, and the eucharist indicate a very considerable growth of ritualism, as

pared with what is found in the New Testament, and yet much less than appears in the Apostolical Constitutions. In the New Testament nothing is required but to profess faith in Christ, and purposed repentance, and the form of the administration has been left so undefined that nobody knows certainly what was the mode of apostolical baptism. In the "Teaching" a preparatory process is dictated, which, however, relates almost entirely to certain details and formalities. No profession of faith is required, no creed recited, but only the subject is to be baptized in the name of the holy Trinity. As to the mode much more is required, but just what it was is very uncertain. "Living" [running?] water must be used, for which requirement neither authority nor reason is given; but the requirement was not absolute, for other water might be used; and if cold water was not at hand, then warm water would serve, and in the absence of both, [in sufficient quantity,] then it was sufficient if water were poured on the head three times, in the name of the Sacred Persons. The reading of the text, and especially the force of the word *in*, (ἐν,) seems to imply that the baptized must enter the water of baptism; but whether so that his whole body should be immersed, or only so as to cover his feet, the text does not determine—the ancient *iconographs* favor the latter, and the only thing that seems to be considered indispensable was the threefold affusion upon the head, *into* (εἰς) the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

In respect to who were or could be subjects of baptism, it has been claimed that the necessary implication is that none but adults could comply with the required conditions, and because nothing is said about any others the inference is that no other subjects were thought of as possible. But, at most, this evidence is only negative, and so leaves room for another conclusion; and as there were no vows to be taken nor creed to be professed, and as it is known that even little children were subjected to fastings in patristic times, the implication referred to is far from being conclusive. No word is said about either the moral or spiritual significance of baptism, though it is named as a prerequisite to uniting in the eucharist, which has a remote glancing at the magical effects of baptism, that afterward become the prevailing belief.

The eucharist—the Lord's Supper of Protestantism—appears

to have been regarded chiefly, as its name suggests, as a service of thanksgiving; not specifically for God's great gift of his Son, but generally for all good things. There is no allusion to either a commemoration or a symbolizing of Christ's death, which not only sweeps away all thought of transubstantiation, but also empties the service of the characteristics for which all grades of orthodox Protestants value the sacred ordinance. The Apostolical Constitutions, in their prescribed order for the administration of this sacrament, are much more in accordance with the modern, and certainly the scriptural, idea; for whatever may be thought of some other things found in them, this whole service, as there set forth, is both more scriptural and evangelical, and incomparably richer than that under notice.

Though very moderately liturgical in comparison with the elaborate forms that were instituted in later times, yet, as compared with what is found in the New Testament, what is contained in the "Teaching" shows no inconsiderable advance in that direction. This may be seen in the prescriptions respecting the forms and conditions to be observed in the administration of the two sacraments, most of which are clearly extra-scriptural, and in some things puerile. Somewhat elaborate prescriptions are also given respecting prayer. Three times a day each one was directed to pray, using the Lord's prayer as given by Matthew, including the doxology, except that "the kingdom" is not named. The presence of this doxology, which is not found in the oldest copies of the New Testament, and is omitted from the Revised Version, indicates the development of liturgical forms in the early Church, which, however, in this case was still incomplete. Somewhat elaborate forms of thanksgiving at the eucharistic feast are given, with the significant permission that the prophets may give thanks as much as they will. The eucharist was to be celebrated every Lord's day, which appears to have been the practice from the beginning, and was to be preceded by the confession of sin, apparently to the whole Church, and if there were "quarrels" between any they must be reconciled.

The closing exhortation brings into notice the well-known fact, that in the early Church the expectation of the speedy coming of Christ was very generally prevalent. The words here

used imply that so imminent was that stupendous event that each one ought to be always expecting its manifestation. Some things in the apostolical epistles seem certainly to favor that view, and with such preconceptions it was easy to interpret our Lord's words in Matthew xxiv, xxv, in the same way. On the face of the words St. Paul seems evidently to have declared the event near at hand, and both he and some others of the apostolic writers use the fact of the early coming of Christ as a motive to diligence and long-suffering on the part of Christians—motives which are readily deduced from the certainty and the nearness of death, to which, however, they seldom definitely refer. But the lapse of eighteen hundred years, without the fulfillment of the expectation, suggests the necessity for reconsidering the whole subject with the aid of the facts of history.

Intimations have occurred that after all this pretended discovery may turn out to be a cheat or a forgery;* but the proof of its genuineness as an ancient production, and of its identity with the work of the same name referred to by the fathers of the early Church, scarcely admits of doubt. The quotations made from the "Teaching" still found in the writings of the fathers are identical with what is found in the newly discovered manuscript, and taking these for their guide a company of German scholars a few years ago set about reproducing the original, which was published just about the time that the original was discovered, and the two are found to coincide with remarkable exactness. The manuscript has also been seen and somewhat scrutinized by several trustworthy scholars —among them Dr. Long, of Robert College—and they seem to have had no doubt that the manuscript is really what its discoverer supposed. If genuine, however, its value as an authority is still an open question. It was reckoned as apocryphal by the fathers, and it has internal signs of not being a trustworthy expression of the early Church in its apostolical catholicity, if, indeed, that specific characteristic had been developed at the date of this document, which may be doubted.

For the benefit of our readers who may not have seen a copy of the "Teaching," and that the above remarks may be the better appreciated, we give in the following pages the original text, with a pretty exact translation, of the famous tract.

ΔΙΔΑΧΗ ΤΩΝ ΔΩΔΕΚΑ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ.

Διδαχὴ Κυρίου διὰ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

Κεφ. *ά.* 'Οδοὶ δύο εἰσί, μία τῆς ζωῆς καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου, διαφορὰ
2 δὲ πολλὴ μεταξὺ τῶν δύο ὁδῶν. 'Η μὲν οὖν ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς ἐστιν
3 αὕτη· πρῶτον, ἀγαπήσεις τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ποιήσαντά σε· δεύτερον, τὸν
4 πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν· πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἐὰν θελήσῃς μὴ γίνεσθαί
5 σοι, καὶ σὺ ἄλλῳ μὴ ποίει· Τούτων δὲ τῶν λόγων ἡ διδαχή ἐστιν
6 αὕτη· Εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμῖν καὶ προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ
τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν, νηστεύετε δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων ὑμᾶς· ποία
γὰρ χάρις, ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς; οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ ἔθνη
τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν; ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς καὶ οὐχ
7 ἕξετε ἐχθρόν. 'Απέχου τῶν σαρκικῶν καὶ κοσμικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν.
8 'Εάν τις σοι δῷ ῥάπισμα εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν διαγόνα, στρέψον αὐτῷ
καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, καὶ ἔσῃ τέλειος· ἐὰν ἀγγαρεύσῃ σέ τις μίλιον ἕν,
ὕπαγε μετ' αὐτοῦ δύο· ἐὰν ἄρῃ τις τὸ ἱμάτιόν σου, δὸς αὐτῷ καὶ
τὸν χιτῶνα· ἐὰν λάβῃ τις ἀπὸ σοῦ τὸ σόν, μὴ ἀπαίτει· οὐδὲ γὰρ
9 δύνασαι. Παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου καὶ μὴ ἀπαίτει· πᾶσι γὰρ
10 θέλει δίδοσθαι ὁ πατὴρ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων χαρισμάτων. Μακάριος ὁ
11 διδοὺς κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν· ἀθῷος γάρ ἐστιν· οὐαὶ τῷ λαμβάνοντι·
εἰ μὲν γὰρ χρείαν ἔχων λαμβάνει τις, ἀθῷος ἔσται· ὁ δὲ μὴ χρείαν
ἔχων δώσει δίκην, ἱνατί ἔλαβε καὶ εἰς τί, ἐν συνοχῇ δὲ γενόμενος
ἐξετασθήσεται περὶ ὧν ἔπραξε, καὶ οὐκ ἐξελεύσεται ἐκεῖθεν μέχρις
οὗ ἀποδῷ τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην. 'Αλλὰ καὶ περὶ τούτου δὴ
12 εἴρηται· 'Ιδρωσάτω ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη σου εἰς τὰς χεῖράς σου, μέχρις
ἂν γνῷς τίνι δῷς.

Κεφ. *β'.* Δευτέρα δὲ ἐντολὴ τῆς διδαχῆς. Οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύ-
2 σεις, οὐ παιδοφθορήσεις, οὐ πορνεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ μαγεύσεις,
οὐ φαρμακεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις τέκνον ἐν φθορᾷ οὐδὲ γεννηθὲν
3 ἀποκτενεῖς. Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὰ τοῦ πλησίον, οὐκ ἐπιορκήσεις,
4 οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, οὐ κακολογήσεις, οὐ μνησικακήσεις. Οὐκ
ἔσῃ δίγνώμων οὐδὲ δίγλωσσος· παγὶς γὰρ θανάτου ἡ δίγλωσσία.
5 Οὐκ ἔσται ὁ λόγος σου ψευδής, οὐ κενός, ἀλλὰ μεμεστωμένος πράξει.
6 Οὐκ ἔσῃ πλεονέκτης οὐδὲ ἅρπαξ οὐδὲ ὑποκριτὴς οὐδὲ κακοήθης
7 οὐδὲ ὑπερήφανος. Οὐ λήψῃ βουλὴν πονηρὰν κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον
8 σου. Οὐ μισήσεις πάντα ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ οὓς μὲν ἐλέγξεις, περὶ
δὲ ὧν προσεύξῃ, οὓς δὲ ἀγαπήσεις ὑπὲρ τὴν ψυχήν σου.

TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES.

Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles to the Nations.

CHAPTER I. There are two ways, one of life and one of death, and the difference between the two ways is great.
2 The way of life, then, is this:
3 First, Thou shalt love the God who made thee:
4 Second, Thy neighbor as thyself; and all things whatsoever thou wouldst not have befall thee, do thou, too, not to another.
5 And of these words the Teaching is this: Bless them that
6 curse you, and pray for your enemies, and fast for them that persecute you; for what thank *have ye* if ye love them that love you? do not the nations also the same? but love ye them that hate you, and ye shall not have an enemy.
7 Abstain from fleshly and worldly lusts.
8 If one give thee a blow on the right cheek, turn to him the other also, and thou shalt be perfect; if any one press thee into service for one mile, go with him two; if one take away thy cloak, give him thy coat also; if one take from thee thine own, ask *it* not back; for not even canst thou.
9 Give to every one that asketh thee, and ask not back; for to all the Father wills that there be given of his own free
10 gifts. Blessed is he that giveth according to the command-
11 ment; for he is guiltless. Woe to him that receiveth; for [but] if, indeed, one that hath need receiveth, he shall be guiltless; but he that hath not need, shall submit to trial *with reference to* why he received and for what *purpose*, and, having come into custody, shall be examined with reference to what he did, and shall not go forth thence until he have paid the last farthing.
12 But concerning this, also, it hath been said: Let thine alms sweat in thy hands until thou know to whom to give.

CHAP. II. And *the* second commandment of the Teaching *is:*
2 Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not corrupt boys, thou shalt not commit fornication, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not use magic arts, thou shalt not practice sorcery, thou shalt not kill a child by abortion nor put it
3 to death when born. Thou shalt not covet the things of thy neighbor, thou shalt not forswear thyself, thou shalt not bear false witness, thou shalt not speak evil, thou shalt not bear a
4 grudge. Thou shalt not be double-minded nor double-
5 tongued; for doubleness of tongue is a snare of death. Thy word shall not be false, nor empty, but fulfilled by deed.
6 Thou shalt not be covetous, nor rapacious, nor a hypocrite,
7 nor malicious, nor haughty. Thou shalt not take evil counsel
8 against thy neighbor. Thou shalt not hate any man, but some thou shalt reprove, and for some thou shalt pray, and some thou shalt love above thy life.

Κεφ. γ'. Τέκνον μου, φεῦγε ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ καὶ ἀπὸ παντὸς
2 ὁμοίου αὐτοῦ. Μὴ γίνου ὀργίλος· ὁδηγεῖ γὰρ ἡ ὀργὴ πρὸς τὸν
φόνον· μηδὲ ζηλωτὴς μηδὲ ἐριστικὸς μηδὲ θυμικός· ἐκ γὰρ τούτων
3 ἁπάντων φόνοι γεννῶνται. Τέκνον μου, μὴ γίνου ἐπιθυμητής·
ὁδηγεῖ γὰρ ἡ ἐπιθυμία πρὸς τὴν πορνείαν· μηδὲ αἰσχρολόγος μηδὲ
ὑψηλόφθαλμος ἐκ γὰρ τούτων ἁπάντων μοιχεῖαι γεννῶνται.
4 Τέκνον μου, μὴ γίνου οἰωνοσκόπος· ἐπειδὴ ὁδηγεῖ εἰς τὴν εἰδωλο-
λατρείαν· μηδὲ ἐπαοιδὸς μηδὲ μαθηματικὸς μηδὲ περικαθαίρων,
μηδὲ θέλε αὐτὰ βλέπειν· ἐκ γὰρ τούτων ἁπάντων εἰδωλολατρεία
5 γεννᾶται. Τέκνον μου, μὴ γίνου ψεύστης· ἐπειδὴ ὁδηγεῖ τὸ ψευσ-
μα εἰς τὴν κλοπήν· μηδὲ φιλάργυρος μηδὲ κενόδοξος· ἐκ γὰρ τού-
6 των ἁπάντων κλοπαὶ γεννῶνται. Τέκνον μου, μὴ γίνου γόγγυσος·
7 ἐπειδὴ ὁδηγεῖ εἰς τὴν βλασφημίαν· μηδὲ αὐθάδης μηδὲ πονηρό-
φρων· ἐκ γὰρ τούτων ἁπάντων βλασφημίαι γεννῶνται. Ἴσθι
8 δὲ πραΰς, ἐπεὶ οἱ πραεῖς κληρονομήσουσι τὴν γῆν. Γίνου μακρό-
θυμος καὶ ἐλεήμων καὶ ἄκακος καὶ ἡσύχιος καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ τρέμων
9 τοὺς λόγους διὰ παντός, οὓς ἤκουσας. Οὐχ ὑψώσεις σεαυτὸν οὐδὲ
10 δώσεις τῇ ψυχῇ σου θράσος. Οὐ κολληθήσεται ἡ ψυχή σου μετὰ
11 ὑψηλῶν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ δικαίων καὶ ταπεινῶν ἀναστραφήσῃ. Τὰ
συμβαίνοντά σοι ἐνεργήματα ὡς ἀγαθὰ προσδέξῃ, εἰδὼς ὅτι ἄτερ
Θεοῦ οὐδὲν γίνεται.

Κεφ. δ'. Τέκνον μου, τοῦ λαλοῦντός σοι τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ μνησ-
θήσῃ νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, τιμήσεις δὲ αὐτὸν ὡς Κύριον· ὅθεν γὰρ
2 ἡ κυριότης λαλεῖται, ἐκεῖ Κύριός ἐστιν. Ἐκζητήσεις δὲ καθ'
ἡμέραν τὰ πρόσωπα τῶν ἁγίων, ἵνα ἐπαναπαύῃ τοῖς λόγοις αὐτῶν.
3 Οὐ ποθήσεις σχίσμα, εἰρηνεύσεις δὲ μαχομένους· κρινεῖς δικαίως,
4 οὐ λήψῃ πρόσωπον ἐλέγξαι ἐπὶ παραπτώμασιν. Οὐ διψυχήσεις,
5 πότερον ἔσται ἢ οὔ. Μὴ γίνου πρὸς μὲν τὸ λαβεῖν ἐκτείνων τὰς
χεῖρας, πρὸς δὲ τὸ δοῦναι συσπῶν· ἐὰν ἔχῃς, διὰ τῶν χειρῶν σου
6 δώσεις λύτρωσιν ἁμαρτιῶν σου. Οὐ διστάσεις δοῦναι οὐδὲ διδοὺς
γογγύσεις· γνώσῃ γὰρ τίς ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ μισθοῦ καλὸς ἀνταποδότης.
7 Οὐκ ἀποστραφήσῃ τὸν ἐνδεόμενον, συγκοινωνήσεις δὲ πάντα τῷ
ἀδελφῷ σου καὶ οὐκ ἐρεῖς ἴδια εἶναι· εἰ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἀθανάτῳ κοι-
8 νωνοί ἐστε, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς θνητοῖς; Οὐκ ἀρεῖς τὴν χεῖρά
σου ἀπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ σου ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς θυγατρός σου, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ νεότητος
9 διδάξεις τὸν φόβον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Οὐκ ἐπιτάξεις δούλῳ σου ἢ παιδίσ-

CHAP. III. My child, flee from every evil *thing*, and from every thing like it.
2 Be not prone to anger, for anger leadeth to murder; nor jealous, nor contentious, nor passionate; for out of all these, murders are begotten.
3 My child, be not one that lusteth, for lust leadeth to fornication; nor of foul speech, nor of leering eyes; for out of all these, adulteries are begotten.
4 My child, be not an augur, since *augury* leadeth to idolatry; nor an enchanter; nor an astrologer; nor a purifier [a concoctor of charms?]; nor be willing to behold these things; for out of all these, idolatry is begotten.
5 My child, be not a liar, since lying leadeth to theft, nor a lover of money, nor vain-glorious; for out of all these, thefts are begotten.
6 My child, be not a murmurer, since *murmuring* leadeth to blasphemy; nor self-willed, nor evil-minded, for out of all these, blasphemies are begotten.
7 But be meek, since the meek shall inherit the earth. Be
8 long-suffering and pitiful and guileless and quiet and good, and continually trembling at the words which thou hast heard.
9 Thou shalt not exalt thyself, nor give assurance to thy soul.
10 Thy soul shall not be joined with lofty *ones*, but with righteous and lowly *ones* shalt thou hold converse.
11 The events that befall thee, thou shalt accept as good, knowing that nothing cometh to pass without God.

CHAP. IV. My child, him that speaketh to thee the word of God, thou shalt remember night and day, and shalt honor him as *the* Lord; for where the sovereignty of the Lord is proclaimed, there is *the* Lord.
2 And thou shalt seek out daily the faces of the saints, that thou mayest rest upon their words.
3 Thou shalt not be desirous of division, but shalt bring contending *ones* to peace; thou shalt judge righteously; thou shalt not respect persons in reproving for transgressions.
4 Thou shalt not hesitate whether *this* shall be or not.
5 Be not *one* that with reference to receiving stretcheth out the hands, but with reference to giving contracteth *them:* thou shalt give by thy hands a ransom, if thou have *it*, for thy sins.
6 Thou shalt not hesitate to give, nor when giving shalt thou murmur; for thou shalt know who is the good Recompenser
7 of the offering. Thou shalt not turn away from him that is in want, but shalt share all things with thy brother, and shalt not say that they are thine own; for if ye are partakers [together] in that which is immortal, how much more in the things which are mortal.
8 Thou shalt not remove thy hand from thy son or from thy daughter, but from youth shalt teach *them* the fear of God.
9 Thou shalt not lay commands in thy bitterness on thy

κη, τοῖς ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Θεὸν ἐλπίζουσιν, ἐν πικρίᾳ σου, μήποτε οὐ μὴ φοβηθήσονται τὸν ἐπ' ἀμφοτέροις Θεόν· οὐ γὰρ ἔρχεται κατὰ
10 πρόσωπον καλέσαι, ἀλλ' ἐφ' οὓς τὸ πνεῦμα ἡτοίμασεν. Ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ δοῦλοι ὑποταγήσεσθε τοῖς κυρίοις ὑμῶν ὡς τύπῳ Θεοῦ ἐν αἰσ-
11 χύνῃ καὶ φόβῳ. Μισήσεις πᾶσαν ὑπόκρισιν καὶ πᾶν ὃ μὴ ἀρεστὸν
12 τῷ Κυρίῳ. Οὐ μὴ ἐγκαταλίπῃς ἐντολὰς Κυρίου, φυλάξεις δὲ ἃ
13 παρέλαβες, μήτε προστιθεὶς μήτε ἀφαιρῶν. Ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐξομολογήσῃ τὰ παραπτώματά σου, καὶ οὐ προσελεύσῃ ἐπὶ προσευχήν
14 σου ἐν συνειδήσει πονηρᾷ. Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ζωῆς.

Κεφ. ε'. Ἡ δὲ τοῦ θανάτου ὁδός ἐστιν αὕτη· πρῶτον πάντων
2,3 πονηρά ἐστι καὶ κατάρας μεστή· φόνοι, μοιχεῖαι, ἐπιθυμίαι, πορνεῖαι, κλοπαί, εἰδωλολατρεῖαι, μαγεῖαι, φαρμακεῖαι, ἁρπαγαί, ψευ-
4 δομαρτυρίαι, ὑποκρίσεις, διπλοκαρδία, δόλος, ὑπερηφανία, κακία,
5 αὐθάδεια, πλεονεξία, αἰσχρολογία, ζηλοτυπία, θρασύτης, ὕψος,
6 ἀλαζονεία· διῶκται ἀγαθῶν, μισοῦντες ἀλήθειαν, ἀγαπῶντες ψεῦδος, οὐ γινώσκοντες μισθὸν δικαιοσύνης, οὐ κολλώμενοι ἀγαθῷ οὐδὲ κρίσει δικαίᾳ, ἀγρυπνοῦντες οὐκ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ
7 πονηρόν· ὧν μακρὰν πραυτης καὶ ὑπομονή, μάταια ἀγαπῶντες, διώκοντες ἀνταπόδομα, οὐκ ἐλεοῦντες πτωχόν, οὐ πονοῦντες ἐπὶ
8 καταπονουμένῳ, οὐ γινώσκοντες τὸν ποιήσαντα αὐτούς, φονεῖς
9 τέκνων, φθορεῖς πλάσματος Θεοῦ, ἀποστρεφόμενοι τὸν ἐνδεόμενον, καταπονοῦντες τὸν θλιβόμενον, πλουσίων παράκλητοι, πενήτων
10 ἄνομοι κριταί, πανθαμάρτητοι· ῥυσθείητε, τέκνα, ἀπὸ τούτων ἁπάντων.

Κεφ. ς'. Ὅρα μή τις σε πλανήσῃ ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς διδαχῆς,
2 ἐπεὶ παρεκτὸς Θεοῦ σε διδάσκει. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ δύνασαι βαστάσαι ὅλον τὸν ζυγὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, τέλειος ἔσῃ· εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι, ὃ δύνῃ
3 τοῦτο ποίει. Περὶ δὲ τῆς βρώσεως, ὃ δύνασαι βάστασον· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ εἰδωλοθύτου λίαν πρόσεχε· λατρεία γάρ ἐστι θεῶν νεκρῶν.

Κεφ. ζ'. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος, οὕτω βαπτίσατε· ταῦτα πάντα
2 προειπόντες, βαπτίσατε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ
3 τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐν ὕδατι ζῶντι. Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἔχῃς ὕδωρ ζῶν, εἰς ἄλλο ὕδωρ βάπτισον· εἰ δ' οὐ δύνασαι ἐν ψυχρῷ, ἐν θερμῷ.
4 Ἐὰν δὲ ἀμφότερα μὴ ἔχῃς, ἔκχεον εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν τρὶς ὕδωρ εἰς
5 ὄνομα Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Πρὸ δὲ τοῦ βαπτίσματος προνηστευσάτω ὁ βαπτίζων καὶ ὁ βαπτιζόμενος καὶ εἴ τινες ἄλλοι δύνανται· κελεύσεις δὲ νηστεῦσαι τὸν βαπτιζόμενον πρὸ μιᾶς ἢ δύο.

bondman or maid-servant, who hope in the same God, lest perchance they shall not fear the God who is over both; for he cometh not to call according to appearance, but unto those whom
10 the Spirit hath prepared. And ye, the bondmen, shall, in modesty and fear, be subject to your masters as to a type of God.
11 Thou shalt hate all hypocrisy and every thing that *is* not pleasing to the Lord.
12 Do not in any wise forsake *the* commandments of *the* Lord; but thou shalt guard what thou hast received, neither adding thereto nor taking therefrom.
13 In *the* church thou shalt confess thy transgressions, and thou shalt not come to thy prayer with an evil conscience.
14 This is the Way of Life.

CHAP. V. And the Way of Death is this:
2, 3 First of all, it is evil and full of curse; murders, adulteries, lusts, fornications, thefts, idolatries, magic practices, sorceries,
4 rapines; false testimonies, hypocrisies, double-heartedness, de-
5 ceit, haughtiness; malice, self-will, covetousness, filthy talking,
6 jealousy, self-assurance, loftiness, boastfulness; persecutors of good *men*, hating truth, loving falsehood, not knowing *the* reward of righteousness, not joined to *any thing* good nor to righteous judgment, watching not with a view to good, but
7 with a view to evil; far from whom *are* meekness and patience, loving vain things, pursuing a requital, not pitying a poor *man*, not toiling for one borne down with toil, not knowing Him
8 that made them; murderers of children, destroyers of God's
9 handiwork; turning away from him that is in want, oppressing him that is afflicted, rich *men's* advocates, poor *men's* lawless judges; utter sinners.
10 May ye be delivered, children, from all these.

CHAP. VI. See that no one cause thee to wander from this Way of the Teaching, since *thus* aloof [away] from God doth he
2 teach thee. For, if thou art able to bear the whole yoke of the Lord, thou shalt be perfect; but if thou art not able, what thou art able, that do.
3 And concerning food, brook [abstain from] what thou art able; but of that which is sacrificed to idols beware exceedingly, for it is a worship of dead gods.

CHAP. VII. And concerning baptism, thus baptize ye:
2 Having first said all these things, baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in living
3 water. But if thou have not living water, baptize into other
4 water; and if thou canst not in cold, in warm. But if thou have not either, pour out water thrice upon the head, into the
5 name of Father and Son and Holy Spirit. But before the baptism, let the baptizer and the baptized fast, and any others, if they can; and thou shalt command the baptized to fast one or two days before.

Κεφ. ή. Αἱ δὲ νηστεῖαι ὑμῶν μὴ ἔστωσαν μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν· νηστεύουσι γὰρ δευτέρᾳ σαββάτων καὶ πέμπτῃ· ὑμεῖς δὲ νηστεύσατε
2 τετράδα καὶ παρασκευήν. Μηδὲ προσεύχεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ αὐτοῦ, οὕτω προσεύ-
3 χεσθε· Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου, ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς· τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἡμῶν ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίεμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν, καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ· ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.
4 Τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας οὕτω προσεύχεσθε.

Κεφ. θ'. Περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐχαριστίας, οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε· πρῶτον
2 περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου· Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαβὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ
3 Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου· σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλάσματος· Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, Πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου· σοὶ ἡ
4 δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ὥσπερ ἦν τοῦτο κλάσμα διεσκορπισμένον ἐπάνω τῶν ὀρέων καὶ συναχθὲν ἐγένετο ἕν, οὕτω συναχθήτω σου ἡ ἐκκλησία ἀπὸ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δύναμις διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶ-
5 νας. Μηδεὶς δὲ φαγέτω μηδὲ πιέτω ἀπὸ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' οἱ βαπτισθέντες εἰς ὄνομα Κυρίου· καὶ γὰρ περὶ τούτου εἴρηκεν ὁ Κύριος· Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσί.

Κεφ. ί. Μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε· Εὐχαρισ-
2 τοῦμέν σοι, Πάτερ ἅγιε, ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἁγίου ὀνόματός σου, οὗ κατεσκήνωσας ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς γνώσεως καὶ πίστεως καὶ ἀθανασίας, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου·
3 σοὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Σύ, δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός σου, τροφήν τε καὶ ποτὸν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰς ἀπόλαυσιν ἵνα σοι εὐχαριστήσωσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ ἐχαρίσω πνευματικὴν τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ τοῦ
4 παιδός σου. Πρὸ πάντων εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι ὅτι δυνατὸς εἶ· σοὶ ἡ
5 δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τῆς ἐκκλησίας σου τοῦ ῥύσασθαι αὐτὴν ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ καὶ τελειῶσαι αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ σου, καὶ σύναξον αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, τὴν ἁγιασθεῖσαν εἰς τὴν σὴν βασιλείαν, ἣν ἡτοίμασας αὐτῇ· ὅτι σοῦ
6 ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Ἐλθέτω χάρις καὶ
7 παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὗτος. Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαβίδ. Εἴ τις ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἐρχέσθω· εἴ τις οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοείτω· μαραναθά.
8 Ἀμήν. Τοῖς δὲ προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν.

CHAP. VIII. But let not your fastings be with the hypocrites; for they fast on *the* Second *Day* of the week and on *the* Fifth; but do ye fast *the* Fourth and Preparation.

2 Neither pray ye as the hypocrites, but as the Lord commanded in his gospel, thus pray:

3 Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, *so* also on earth. Give us to-day our daily bread, and forgive us our debt as we, too, forgive our debtors. And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil; for thine is the power and the glory forever.

4 Pray thus three times in the day.

CHAP. IX. And concerning the Eucharist, thus give thanks.

First, concerning the cup:

2 We thank thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David, thy servant, which thou hast made known to us through Jesus thy servant; to thee *be* the glory forever.

3 And concerning the broken *bread:*

We thank thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which thou hast made known to us through Jesus thy serv-

4 ant; to thee *be* the glory forever. Just as this, a broken piece, was scattered upon the hills, and was gathered together and became one, so let thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into thy kingdom; for thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever.

5 But let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist, but those that have been baptized into *the* name of *the* Lord; for concerning this the Lord hath said: Give not that which is holy to the dogs.

CHAP. X. And after being filled, thus give thanks:

2 We thank thee, holy Father, for thy holy name, which thou hast caused to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality, which thou hast made known to us through Jesus thy servant; to thee *be* the glory forever.

3 Thou, Almighty Sovereign, didst create the universe for thy name's sake; both food and drink thou gavest men for enjoyment, that they might give thanks to thee; but to us thou hast graciously given spiritual food and drink and life eternal

4 through thy servant. Before all things, we thank thee that

5 thou art mighty: to thee *be* the glory forever. Remember, Lord, thy Church, to deliver it from every evil and to make it perfect in thy love; and do thou gather it from the four winds, the sanctified *Church*, into thy kingdom, which thou hast prepared for it; for thine is the power and the glory for-

6 ever. Let grace come, and let this world pass away. Ho-

7 sannah to the Son of David. If any one is holy, let him come: if any one is not, let him repent: Maranatha. Amen.

8 But permit the prophets to express what thanks they wish.

Κεφ. ιά. Ὃς ἂν οὖν ἐλθὼν διδάξῃ ὑμᾶς ταῦτα πάντα, τὰ προειρημένα, δέξασθε αὐτόν· ἐὰν δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ διδάσκων στραφεὶς διδάσκῃ ἄλλην διδαχὴν εἰς τὸ καταλῦσαι, μὴ αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε· εἰς δὲ τὸ προσθεῖναι δικαιοσύνην καὶ γνῶσιν Κυρίου, δέξασθε αὐτὸν ὡς
2 Κύριον. Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν κατὰ τὸ δόγμα
3 τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὕτω ποιήσατε. Πᾶς δὲ ἀπόστολος ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς δεχθήτω ὡς Κύριος· οὐ μενεῖ δὲ ἡμέραν μίαν· ἐὰν δὲ ᾖ χρεία, καὶ τὴν ἄλλην· τρεῖς δὲ ἐὰν μείνῃ, ψευδοπροφήτης ἐστίν.
4 Ἐξερχόμενος δὲ ὁ ἀπόστολος μηδὲν λαμβανέτω εἰμὴ ἄρτον ἕως οὗ
5 αὐλισθῇ· ἐὰν δὲ ἀργύριον αἰτῇ, ψευδοπροφήτης ἐστί. Καὶ πάντα προφήτην λαλοῦντα ἐν πνεύματι οὐ πειράσετε οὐδὲ διακρινεῖτε· πᾶσα γὰρ ἁμαρτία ἀφεθήσεται, αὕτη δὲ ἡ ἁμαρτία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.
6 Οὐ πᾶς δὲ ὁ λαλῶν ἐν πνεύματι προφήτης ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἐὰν ἔχῃ
7 τοὺς τρόπους Κυρίου. Ἀπὸ οὖν τῶν τρόπων γνωσθήσεται ὁ ψευ-
8 δοπροφήτης καὶ ὁ προφήτης. Καὶ πᾶς προφήτης ὁρίζων τράπεζαν ἐν πνεύματι, οὐ φάγεται ἀπ' αὐτῆς, εἰδὲ μήγε ψευδοπροφήτης ἐστί· πᾶς δὲ προφήτης διδάσκων τὴν ἀλήθειαν, εἰ ἃ διδάσκει οὐ
9 ποιεῖ, ψευδοπροφήτης ἐστί. Πᾶς δὲ προφήτης δεδοκιμασμένος, ἀληθινός, ποιῶν εἰς μυστήριον κοσμικὸν ἐκκλησίας, μὴ διδάσκων δὲ ποιεῖν ὅσα αὐτὸς ποιεῖ, οὐ κριθήσεται ἐφ' ὑμῶν· μετὰ Θεοῦ γὰρ ἔχει τὴν κρίσιν· ὡσαύτως γὰρ ἐποίησαν καὶ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι προφῆται.
10 Ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ ἐν πνεύματι· Δός μοι ἀργύρια ἢ ἕτερά τινα, οὐκ ἀκούσεσθε αὐτοῦ· ἐὰν δὲ περὶ ἄλλων ὑστερούντων εἴπῃ δοῦναι, μηδεὶς αὐτὸν κρινέτω.

Κεφ. ιβ'. Πᾶς δὲ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου δεχθήτω, ἔπειτα δὲ δοκιμάσαντες αὐτὸν γνώσεσθε· σύνεσιν γὰρ ἕξετε δεξιὰν καὶ ἀρι-
2 στεράν. Εἰμὲν παρόδιός ἐστιν ὁ ἐρχόμενος, βοηθεῖτε αὐτῷ ὅσον δύνασθε· οὐ μενεῖ δὲ πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰ μὴ δύο ἢ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, ἐὰν ᾖ
3 ἀνάγκη. Εἰ δὲ θέλει πρὸς ὑμᾶς καθῆσαι, τεχνίτης ὤν, ἐργαζέσθω καὶ φαγέτω· εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔχει τέχνην, κατὰ τὴν σύνεσιν ὑμῶν προνοή-
4 σατε, πῶς μὴ ἀργὸς μεθ' ὑμῶν ζήσεται χριστιανός. Εἰ δ' οὐ θέλει οὕτω ποιεῖν, χριστέμπορός ἐστι· προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν τοιούτων.

Κεφ. ιγ'. Πᾶς δὲ προφήτης ἀληθινός, θέλων καθῆσαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς,
2 ἄξιός ἐστι τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ· Ὡσαύτως διδάσκαλος ἀληθινός
3 ἐστιν ἄξιος καὶ αὐτὸς ὥσπερ ὁ ἐργάτης, τῆς τροφῆς αὐτοῦ. Πᾶσαν οὖν ἀπαρχὴν γεννημάτων ληνοῦ καὶ ἅλωνος, βοῶν τε καὶ προβάτων λαβὼν δώσεις τοῖς προφήταις· αὐτοὶ γάρ εἰσιν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς
4,5 ὑμῶν. Ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἔχητε προφήτην, δότε τοῖς πτωχοῖς. Ἐὰν
6 σιτίαν ποιῇς, τὴν ἀπαρχὴν λαβὼν δὸς κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν. Ὡσαύτως κεράμιον οἴνου ἢ ἐλαίου ἀνοίξας, τὴν ἀπαρχὴν λαβὼν δὸς

CHAP. XI. Whoever, then, shall come and teach all these things, the things aforesaid, receive him; but if the teacher himself turn and teach another doctrine to the destruction of *this*, do not hear him; but *if he teacheth* to the promotion of righteousness and knowledge of *the* Lord, receive him as *the* Lord.

2 And with reference to the apostles and prophets in accord-
3 ance with the ordinance of the gospel, act thus. And let every apostle that cometh to you be received as *the* Lord; but he shall remain, not one day, [only,] but, if there be need, the next
4 also; but if he remain three *days*, he is a false prophet. And let the apostle, when he goeth forth, take nothing except bread *to suffice* until he lodge; but if he ask money, he is a false prophet.
5 And no prophet that speaketh in *the* Spirit, shall ye try or judge; for every sin shall be forgiven, but this sin shall not
6 be forgiven. Not every one, however, that speaketh in *the* Spirit, is a prophet, but *only* if he have the ways of *the* Lord.
7 From their ways, then, shall the false prophet and the prophet
8 be known. And no prophet that in *the* Spirit commandeth a meal, will eat of it, else he is a false prophet; and every prophet that teacheth the truth, if he doeth not what he teach-
9 eth, is a false prophet. And no prophet, approved, true, acting with a view to the world-mystery of the Church, but not teaching *others* to do what he himself doeth, shall be judged in your presence; for with God he hath his judgment;
10 for in like manner did the ancient prophets also. But whoever in *the* Spirit shall say: Give me money, or something else, ye shall not hear him; but if he bid you give for others that are in want, let no one judge him.

CHAP. XII. And let every one that cometh in *the* name of *the* Lord be received, and afterward ye shall prove and know him;
2 for ye shall possess understanding right and left. If he that cometh is a traveler, help him as much as you can; however, he shall not remain with you, except for two or three days, if
3 need be. But if he wisheth to reside with you, being an artisan, let him work and eat; but if he hath not a trade, provide, according to your understanding, that, as a Christian, he shall
4 not live with you idle. But if he doth not wish so to do, he is one that maketh a gain of Christ: beware of such.

CHAP. XIII. But every true prophet that wisheth to reside with
2 you, is worthy of his food. In like manner a true teacher, himself also is worthy of his food, just as the workman.
3 Every first-fruit, then, of *the* products of wine-press and threshing-floor, of oxen and of sheep, thou shalt take and give to the prophets; for they are your high-priests.
4 But if ye have not a prophet, give to the poor.
5 If thou make a baking of bread, take and give the first-
6 fruit according to the commandment. In like manner, on opening a jar of wine or oil, take and give the first-fruit to

τοῖς προφήταις· ἀργυρίου δὲ καὶ ἱματισμοῦ καὶ παντὸς κτήματος λαβὼν τὴν ἀπαρχὴν ὡς ἂν σοι δόξῃ, δὸς κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν.

Κεφ. ιδ'. Κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ Κυρίου συναχθέντες κλάσατε ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσατε προσεξομολογησάμενοι τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν, ὅπως
2 καθαρὰ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν ᾖ. Πᾶς δὲ ἔχων τὴν ἀμφιβολίαν μετὰ τοῦ ἑταίρου αὐτοῦ μὴ συνελθέτω ὑμῖν, ἕως οὗ διαλλαγῶσιν, ἵνα μὴ κοινωθῇ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν· αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ῥηθεῖσα ὑπὸ Κυρίου·
3 Ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ καὶ χρόνῳ προσφέρειν μοι θυσίαν καθαράν· ὅτι βασιλεὺς μέγας εἰμί, λέγει Κύριος, καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου θαυμαστὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι.

Κεφ. ιέ. Χειροτονήσατε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους ἀξίους τοῦ Κυρίου, ἄνδρας πραεῖς καὶ ἀφιλαργύρους καὶ ἀληθεῖς καὶ δεδοκιμασμένους· ὑμῖν γὰρ λειτουργοῦσι καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν λειτουρ-
2 γίαν τῶν προφητῶν καὶ διδασκάλων. Μὴ οὖν ὑπερίδητε αὐτούς· αὐτοὶ γάρ εἰσιν οἱ τετιμημένοι ὑμῶν μετὰ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ διδασκάλων.
3 Ἐλέγχετε δὲ ἀλλήλους μὴ ἐν ὀργῇ, ἀλλ' ἐν εἰρήνῃ, ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· καὶ παντὶ ἀστοχοῦντι κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου μηδεὶς
4 λαλείτω μηδὲ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀκουέτω, ἕως οὐ μετανοήσῃ. Τὰς δὲ εὐχὰς ὑμῶν καὶ τὰς ἐλεημοσύνας καὶ πάσας τὰς πράξεις οὕτω ποιήσατε, ὡς ἔχετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν.

Κεφ. ις'. Γρηγορεῖτε ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς ὑμῶν· οἱ λυχνοι ὑμῶν μὴ σβεσθήτωσαν, καὶ αἱ ὀσφύες ὑμῶν μὴ ἐκλυέσθωσαν, ἀλλὰ γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι· οὐ γὰρ οἴδατε τὴν ὥραν, ἐν ᾗ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν ἔρχεται.
2 Πυκνῶς δὲ συναχθήσεσθε ζητοῦντες τὰ ἀνήκοντα ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν· οὐ γὰρ ὠφελήσει ὑμᾶς ὁ πᾶς χρόνος τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, ἐὰν
3 μὴ ἐν τῷ ἐσχάτῳ καιρῷ τελειωθῆτε. Ἐν γὰρ ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις πληθυνθήσονται οἱ ψευδοπροφῆται καὶ οἱ φθορεῖς καὶ στραφήσονται τὰ πρόβατα εἰς λύκους καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη στραφήσεται εἰς μῖσος· αὐξανούσης γὰρ τῆς ἀνομίας, μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους καὶ διώξουσι καὶ παραδώσουσι, καὶ τότε φανήσεται ὁ κοσμοπλάνος ὡς υἱὸς Θεοῦ καὶ ποιήσει σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, καὶ ἡ γῆ παραδοθήσεται εἰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ποιήσει ἀθέμιτα, ἃ οὐδέποτε γέγονεν ἐξ
4 αἰῶνος. Τότε ἥξει ἡ κτίσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς τὴν πύρωσιν τῆς δοκιμασίας καὶ σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοὶ καὶ ἀπολοῦνται, οἱ δὲ ὑπομείναντες ἐν τῇ πίστει αὐτῶν σωθήσονται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ κατα-
5 θέματος. Καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὰ σημεῖα τῆς ἀληθείας· πρῶτον, σημεῖον ἐκπετάσεως ἐν οὐρανῷ, εἶτα σημεῖον φωνῆς σάλπιγγος καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν· οὐ πάντων δέ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐρρέθη·
6 Ἥξει ὁ Κύριος καὶ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι μετ' αὐτοῦ. Τότε ὄψεται ὁ κόσμος τὸν Κύριον ἐρχόμενον ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

the prophets; and of money and clothing and every possession, take the first-fruit, as it may seem good to thee, and give according to the commandment.

CHAP. XIV. And every Lord's Day gather yourselves together, and break bread and give thanks, after having also confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure.

2 But let no one that is at variance with his fellow assemble with you, until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice may not

3 be profaned; For this is the one that was commanded by *the* Lord: In every place and time, offer Me a pure sacrifice; for I am a great King, saith *the* Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations.

CHAP. XV. Choose, therefore, for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men meek and free from the love of money, and true and proved; for they, too, render you the

2 service of the prophets and teachers. Do not, then, despise them; for together with the prophets and teachers, they are your honored ones.

3 And reprove one another, not in anger, but in peace, as ye have *it* in the gospel; and to every one that acteth amiss against another, let no one speak, and let him not hear from you until he repent.

4 But your prayers and alms and all deeds so do, as ye have *it* in the gospel of our Lord.

CHAP. XVI. Watch for [over] your life; let your lamps not be quenched, and your loins not be loosed, but be ye ready; for ye know not the hour in which our Lord cometh.

2 And ye shall often be gathered together seeking the things which become your souls; for the whole time of your faith will not profit you, if ye be not made perfect in the last time.

3 For in the last days the false prophets and the corrupters shall be multiplied, and the sheep shall be turned into wolves, and love shall be turned into hate; for as lawlessness increaseth, they shall hate one another, and persecute and betray, and then shall appear the world-deceiver as *the* Son of God, and shall do signs and wonders, and the earth shall be delivered into his hands, and he shall do iniquitous things which have never been done since *the* world *began*.

4 Then shall the human creation come into the fire of trial, and many shall be caused to stumble and shall perish; But they that endure in their faith shall be saved from under the curse itself.

5 And then shall appear the signs of the truth; first, *the* sign of an opening in heaven, then *the* sign of *the* sound of a trumpet, and third, *the* resurrection of *the* dead; not of all, however, but as was said: The Lord shall come, and all the

6 saints with Him. Then shall the world see the Lord coming upon the clouds of heaven.

Art. VII. — THE CATHOLIC DOGMA OF CHURCH AUTHORITY.

There can be no doubt that the popular mind regards the Roman Catholic Church and religion as both degenerate and dangerous. The common people take short cuts to conclusions, always, of course, at the risk of doing injustice, but not seldom reaching right results. They form judgments of the various denominations, (except their own,) not by careful study of their systems of doctrine and government, but from public information and limited personal observation. Thus they describe Presbyterians as predestinarians, Baptists as immersionists, Methodists as revivalists. They think of the Universalists as holding to the salvation of sinner and saint alike, of the Unitarians as robbing Christ of his divinity and religion of its heart, and of the Roman Catholics as worshiping Mary and the saints, putting the pope in the place of Christ, and lodging the power to forgive sin in the priest. The Episcopal Church is to them a Church of forms and ceremonies, claiming closer kinship to the Roman than to the Protestant faith. None of these loose popular definitions would, of course, be acceptable to the denominations to which they are applied. They are inadequate; but they contain, it will be hardly disputed, a core of truth. We Methodists believe in revivals. We believe that our Church was raised up to offer salvation to the people; but our system is much more to us than a series of camp-meetings or special revival efforts. So the popular judgment of Romanism is, doubtless, an injustice in some respects; but that Catholic teaching seems to involve the errors thus attributed to it is not to be denied. The question as to how far that Church is responsible for wrong impressions as to its doctrine and practice is a question to be settled in full view of its aims and claims as a Christian Church. It claims to be holy, apostolic, universal, and united, and aims to embrace all mankind within its pale, outside of which there is no salvation. It also claims to be infallible as a teacher of divine truth. If, therefore, it so presents and teaches and appropriates the doctrines of salvation that the common people outside

its communion derive inferences as to its character which it is not willing to accept, there must be some grave fault in the system, or in the practice or presentation of it. A divine religion intended for all must be adapted to all, and must show its credentials in its life and teaching. But allowance must be made for prejudices of education. These prejudices exist, not alone against the Roman Catholic Church, but against all denominations. They have borne, they still bear, strongly against Methodism. But our place in evangelical Christianity is not misapprehended, and the general character of our teaching is not misunderstood. We may be justly chargeable from other stand-points with putting too much stress on this doctrine or too little on that; but we are not accused of holding views repugnant to the common mind of Christianity or to the word of God. It would be unfair to set up the popular judgment against the philosophical basis of any system. Public opinion is not a competent jury in matters requiring research and scholarship; but it is well qualified to weigh and compare results and make deductions from them. Much weight is therefore to be attached to the common verdict against Romanism.

Those who have studied with candid mind the Roman Catholic system are much slower to pronounce an unqualified judgment against it. It is seen to possess many and important features in common with evangelical Christianity; much that is sound and good with the unsound and the false; and charity inclines to magnify what is favorable and underestimate what is unfavorable. It is hard to reach a strictly impartial result. If the object be to ascertain in how many points the Catholic agrees with the Protestant or scriptural system, or how much it differs, the showing in either case will be formidable, and the real truth will perhaps lie between the two extremes. The difficulty which a scholarly and judicial mind meets in studying the life and teaching of the Church of Rome, is not alone in the effort to hold the balance with blind impartiality, but in ascertaining the real character of the practical teaching in diocese and congregation. Catholic preachers are not in the habit of publishing their discourses. Here and there a distinguished prelate or priest, famed for his eloquence, gives to the Catholic people a volume of sermons; but the list of American

Catholic books will be searched in vain for more than a dozen such publications, most of which are not of the present age, and cannot be taken as representative. The chief reason for this scarcity of modern Catholic sermon literature is, doubtless, to be found in the fact that in Catholic services the sermon holds a very subordinate place. "It may or may not form part of the exercises of public worship," we are told by an eminent authority, "according to the occasion and its attendant circumstances. It is less important, and felt to be so by both clergy and people, than visiting the sick, hearing of confessions, administering the sacraments, (not to speak of the offering up of the holy sacrifice of the mass,) which, more imperative duties, necessarily occupy the larger part of the time of Catholic priests." * Nor is there any theological literature, in the proper sense, for the Catholic layman. There is an abundance of Catechisms for the neophyte, a long list of books of devotion, and a copious Catholic story literature, but theology and theological discussion are in the ecclesiastical tongue and for the priests, who do not generally venture, as is the custom of Protestant ministers, to discuss doctrinal subjects for the benefit of the people. How the body of priests understand and teach Catholic doctrine the inquirer cannot, therefore, from these sources, undertake to show exhaustively. There is such a thing as a consensus of Catholic teaching and practice in every country as shown in the spirit of the Church, in the character of priest and layman, in the attitude toward moral, political, educational, and religious questions, in discussions in the Catholic press, and in other ways, which impress the non-Catholic mind; but there is another line of investigation which lies open to every candid and intelligent mind, and cannot, it would seem, fail to reward the investigator with valuable and trustworthy results. It enters into the heart of the system, and taking up the great dogma of Church authority, shows what its bearings are upon the spirit, character, and teachings of the Church. This is the task now proposed, candidly and conscientiously, to be undertaken.

It must, of course, be conceded that the Church of Rome expresses in its symbols and decrees much of the doctrinal

* "American Catholic Quarterly Review," editorial department, p. 752, October, 1881.

truth of Christianity. The Apostles' Creed, which many Protestants deem a sufficient summary to serve as a test of Christian fellowship, is in constant use in Catholic services. The doctrines of the nature, power, and attributes of God, of the persons of the Trinity, of the fall of man, of the inspiration of the Scriptures, of the final destiny of saint and sinner, are hardly ground of dispute between Roman and Protestant Christians. There is much more in belief and practice which is held in common, and much on which the differences do not appear irreconcilable; but there is, nevertheless, a chasm between the two systems which refuses to be bridged. They are as different in spirit, character, and results as are the governments and peoples of Russia and those of the United States. Both countries agree in recognizing the truth that mankind needs governing; but as to the source, character, and application of the governing authority they are at wide variance. Catholicism and Protestantism agree that all men are sinners who may and ought to be saved; but as to the method and means of salvation they are hopelessly divided. The Romanist conception of the kingdom of God which Christ came to establish on earth is not that it is an inward life, born of the Holy Spirit and nourished by divine grace, whose outward manifestation is a godly walk and the fellowship of unity; * but rather that it is a visible human organism endowed with the power of producing and controlling a spiritual life. Not only has God put into the hands of the Roman Communion, which comprehends all there is of the glorious kingdom on earth, the work of saving mankind, but he has placed in its keeping and control the treasures of grace, † so that when it chooses to confer its ordinances or to withhold them it confers or withholds

* The great German theologian's idea of the Church is: "The Church first came into existence with Pentecost. . . . Certainly the entire body of disciples had already an outward center in His person, and his design was that the Church should grow out of that body; but such a Church did not as yet exist before the Holy Spirit had prepared and collected a mature discipleship. The Church is called the temple of the Holy Ghost, consisting of living stones, bearing Christ's life in them; that is, personalities."—Dorner's "System of Christian Doctrine," vol. iv, pp. 345, 346.

† "According to Catholics the recognition of and submission to the visible Church is the ordained means of sharing in the invisible treasures of grace."—"Catholic Dictionary," London and New York, 1884, p. 168. This new and important work is severely criticised for its liberal Catholicism.

saving grace. Let us see if this is not a true statement of their teaching.

Baptism as one of the ordinances committed to the one true Church, the Church of Rome,* is "necessary for all."† It "is as essential for the infant as for the full-grown man, in order to attain the kingdom of heaven."‡ The only exceptions admitted are when an unbaptized person has a desire without opportunity for the ordinance, which is the baptism of desire, or lays down his life for Christ, which is the baptism of blood.§ Obviously, infants are not included in either of these classes. To them God cannot extend his grace, because the ministry of the Church has not reached them. "Is not that," Archbishop Gibbons asks, "a cruel and heartless doctrine which excludes from heaven so many harmless babes that have never committed any fault? To this I reply, Has not God declared that baptism is necessary to all?" The Council of Trent in Canon VII pronounces its *anathema sit* against all those who say that "grace, as far as God's part is concerned, is not given through the said sacraments *always and to all men*, [my italics] even though they receive them rightly, but only sometimes and to some persons."‖ The previous canon lays down the doctrine that the sacraments are not simply outward signs of grace received through faith, but confer the grace they signify on all persons "who do not place an obstacle thereunto;" while Canon VIII anathematizes those who deny that grace is "conferred through the act

* "Butler's Catechism," as "revised by the four Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland," pp. 22–24.

† Chapter IV of the Canons of Trent says that the change from death to life, "since the promulgation of the Gospel, cannot be effected without the laver of regeneration or the desire thereof."—Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom," vol. ii, p. 91. "Butler's Catechism" also says:

"*Q.* Is baptism necessary to salvation?

"*A.* Yes; without it one cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

"*Q.* Who are appointed by Christ to give baptism?

"*A.* The pastors of his Church; but in case of necessity any layman or woman can give it."—P. 46.

‡ "The Faith of our Fathers." By Archbishop Gibbons. John Murphy & Co., Baltimore. 1884. P. 311.

§ Cyprian held, however, that martyrdom outside the Church is not only not meritorious, but rather an aggravation of sin. Hagenbach, vol. i, p. 275.

‖ "Creeds of Christendom," vol. ii, p. 121.

performed." Pope Eugenius IV. held that the sacraments are effected by the things which stand for the matter, by the words which stand for the form, and by the person of the minister, and that if "any one of these three things be wanting, there is no sacrament."* Having by divine authority been invested with the exclusive power of granting the sacraments by which alone the soul can make its way to heaven, it follows that the Church of Rome, as the only true Church on earth, has in its hands the eternal destiny of all mankind.†

The dogma of the supreme authority of the Church is the key to the Catholic system and the cause of its wide variance from the faith and spirit of the Gospel. It would, as every intelligent mind must admit, avail a sinful world but little if Christ had accomplished the work of atonement at the cost of his incarnation, sufferings, and death, and had placed its benefits in the keeping of a power that might withhold or confer them according to a fallible will and an imperfect understanding on its own code of conditions to the recipient. He did, indeed, indicate a prerequisite to the enjoyment of these benefits—a desire to be saved—but he did not commit to fallible human judgment the prerogative of deciding when and to whom the regenerating grace should be imparted. This dogma was of gradual growth. It began with the assumptions of the bishop, developed along with the papacy unto its present tremendous proportions, and has struck its rootlets into every particle of Catholic theological soil. It will be necessary to get a full understanding of its scope and bearings in order to proceed to the accomplishment of the purpose sought in this article. Moehler, who was a very moderate Catholic, and who was criticised for his concessions, gives this definition of the Church:

By the Church on earth Catholics understand the visible community of believers founded by Christ, in which, by means of

* "Catholic Dictionary," p. 736.

† "*Professio Fidei Tridentinæ.*" The "Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved." *Catholicam fidem. extra quam nemo salvus esse potest.* "Creeds of Christendom," vol. ii, p. 210. Also Cardinal Newman in "Answer to Gladstone," p. 159. "No Catholic ever thinks of disputing" the dogma that "out of the Catholic Church and out of the faith there is no salvation." All the popes, bishops, and doctors, he adds, have proclaimed it. Pius IX. excepted, however, those who "lie under invincible ignorance."

an enduring apostleship established by him, and appointed to conduct all nations, in the course of the ages, back to God, the works wrought by him during his earthly life for the redemption and sanctification of mankind are, under the guidance of his Spirit, continued to the end of the world.*

He goes on to show that as God, in planning the redemptive work, chose to send his Word in incarnate, visible form to men, so the doctrine which that Incarnate Word established needed a visible, human medium to declare it; hence the organization of the Church in which Christ continues to live and his Spirit to work. "Thus the visible Church, from the point of view here taken, is the Son of God himself, everlastingly manifesting himself among men in a human form." And as he represented in himself both divinity and humanity, so also is his Church both human and divine; but if the divine "constitute undoubtedly that which is infallible and eternally inerrable in the Church, so also the human is infallible and inerrable in the same way." † The "administration of the sacraments, as well as the preaching of the Word, was intrusted by the Lord to the apostolic college, and to those commissioned by it, so that all believers by means of this apostolic college are linked to the community, and in a living manner connected with it."

The Church, in the Catholic point of view, can as little fail in the pure preservation of the Word as in any other part of her task; she is infallible. As the individual worshiper of Christ is incorporated into the Church by indissoluble bonds, and is by the same conducted unto the Saviour, and abideth in him only in so far as he abideth in the Church, his faith and his conduct are determined by the latter. He must bestow his whole confidence on her; and she must therefore merit the same. ‡

It is therefore necessary, he continues, that she should be inerrable. "To no individual, considered as such, doth infallibility belong," for the individual is only a member of the whole, "living and breathing in the Church. When his feelings, thought, and will are conformable to her spirit, then only can the individual attain to inerrability." If Christ is to be a "true determining authority," the "authority of the Church is necessary," and "Christ himself is only in so far an authority

* "Moehler's "Symbolism." New York: Catholic Publication House. Third edition, p. 253. † *Ibid.*, p. 254. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 261.

as the Church is an authority." "If the Church be not the authority representing Christ, then all again relapses into darkness, uncertainty, doubt, distraction, unbelief, and superstition; revelation becomes null and void, fails of its real purpose, and must henceforth be even called in question, and finally denied."

The Catholic doctrine of the Church, then, is:

1. It is infallible and inerrant.

2. It is infallible and inerrant in both its divine and human elements.

3. It has all ecclesiastical and spiritual power in earth.*

4. God deals with mankind through it alone, and Christ is authority only in so far as it is authority.

5. The believer can abide in Christ only in so far as Christ abides in the Church.

6. The faith and conduct of the believer are determined by the Church.

7. Without the authority of the Church revelation is null and void.

8. This divine, infallible, inerrant, universal, and perpetual authority is the Church of Rome.†

9. Those not subject to the pope, the head of the Church of Rome, are not in the Church of Christ.‡

* The Church is vested *jure divino* with power to make laws, to define and apply them, to punish these who violate them. The punishments inflicted by the Church in exercising her coercive power are chiefly spiritual, namely—excommunication, suspension, and interdict, but she can "inflict temporal, and even corporal, punishments." Thus, according to Cardinal Tarquini, the pope and ecumenical councils have the power to inflict the death penalty, at least by requiring a Catholic ruler to impose it; and "that they cannot directly exercise this power cannot be proved." "Elements of Ecclesiastical Law." By S. B. Smith, D.D. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1883, p. 89. This volume was revised under the direction of Cardinal Simeoni, Prefect of the Propaganda, and approved by Cardinal M'Closkey and a great number of prelates.

† "We must either give up the belief in the Church as a divine institution altogether, or we must recognize it as that communion of which the pope is the head."—Newman, in "Answer to Gladstone." p. 34.

‡ "We declare, affirm, define, and pronounce it to be necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman pontiff."—Pope Boniface VIII., in *Unam Sanctum*, which bull Cardinal Manning says was undoubtedly an infallible utterance. See Manning's "Vatican Decrees." New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1875, p. 57. Cardinal Newman, in "Answer to Gladstone," p. 35, says: "We should not believe in the Church at all unless we believed in its visible head."

But how is this infallibility and inerrancy and authority to be manifested? By the teaching power of the Church. First, in the pope, as the head of the visible, infallible, and inerrant Church, "who has no rival in his claim upon" the faithful.* "As God has sovereignty, though he may be disowned or disobeyed, so has his vicar on earth." † The primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church of God was directly given by Christ to Peter, who "received the keys of the kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ, . . . and lives, presides, and judges to this day and always, in his successors, the Bishop of the Holy See of Rome." "When in the discharge of the office of pastor and teacher of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals," ‡ he is infallible; and both "pastors and faithful, individually and collectively, are bound . . . to submit, not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church," and from this "no one can deviate without loss of faith and of salvation."§ Second, in the pope and the bishops throughout the world, who, "in the ordinary performance of their duty and without formally concerting together, may teach [infallibly] certain truths to the body of the Church as of divine faith." ‖ The bishops are divinely instituted, and are collectively the successors of the college of the apostles and to their governing power. They belong to the divine and unalterable constitution of the Church.¶ Third, this authority of the Church is exercised through the priest who has power to confer regenerating grace,** to forgive sins,†† and to change bread and wine

* Cardinal Newman, "Answer to Gladstone," p. 52. Also "Catholic Dictionary." "None who are not in communion with him are Catholics at all." —P. 177. † *Ibid.*, p. 49.

‡ There is also an infallibility exercised in condemning erroneous books or doctrine, and in the canonization of saints. "Catholic Dictionary," p. 178.

§ "Vatican Decrees." See Schaff's "Creeds of Christendom," pp. 256–271.

‖ "Catholic Dictionary," p. 177. ¶ *Ibid.*, p. 85.

** "He has empowered the priests of the New Law to impart the grace of regeneration in baptism." They are "the dispensers of his graces and the almoners of his mercy."—"The Faith of our Fathers," pp. 443, 444.

†† "To them also he gave power to forgive sins." They "can release the soul from the prison of sin and restore it to the liberty of a child of God."—*Ibid.*, p. 444. "As judge of souls, he must know when to bind and when to loose; when to defer and when to pronounce sentence of absolution."—P. 450.

into the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ.* He, as successor of the apostles, "is clothed with their power," and "exercises power not given even to angels."† This would seem to imply that he is infallible also, though this is not directly claimed for him. But infallibility, according to some authorities, goes below the priest. The "faithful cannot err in what they believe, because the same Holy Spirit which enables them to believe what their pastors teach provides that these pastors shall teach the truth with unerring voice."‡ This is a logical conclusion, whether it has been defined by the Church or not.

The claims and authority of the Church being so sweeping, it follows logically that all men must obey her voice, and this is the Catholic doctrine. Cardinal Manning says the command of Christ to the apostles—"Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature"—"clearly invests the Church with authority to baptize every creature," though this "absolute and universal authority" "depends upon the free and voluntary act of those who believe."§ Christ not only gave this power to his apostles, but he commanded, "under the most severe penalties, those to whom they preach to listen and obey." Their hearers, therefore, "are obliged to listen with docility, and to obey, not merely by external compliance, but also by an internal assent of the intellect."‖

Such is the doctrine of the authority of the Church of Rome. It is a vast and awful absolutism, not only proposing to strip all mankind of liberty of conscience, intellect, and

* Christ is "bid, morning by morning, by their word, to be present upon the altar." "The Eternal Priesthood." By Cardinal Manning. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1883, p. 21. Also "Butler's Catechism," p. 49:

"*Q.* By whom are the bread and wine changed into the body and blood of Christ?

"*A.* By the priest; but in virtue of the words of Christ, whose person the priest represents at the awful moment of consecration."

† "The Faith of our Fathers," p. 441.

‡ "Catholic Dictionary," p. 177. § "The Vatican Decrees," p. 80.

‖ "The Faith of our Fathers," pp. 88, 89. Also "Elements of Ecclesiastical Law," p. 81. "Now every person in the world is bound to obey the Church in matters pertaining to the *sanctificatio animarum*." Mgr. Capel, in the "Nineteenth Century" for April, 1880, says: "To doubt willfully any one article of faith, or to enter on the examination of any dogma with the intention of suspending belief until the conclusion of such examination, would be for a Catholic a deadly sin."

worship, but even presuming to rob God in heaven of his prerogatives in the salvation of men. Its claim of infallibility and authority is only a blasphemous invention; its pretended power to confer the grace of regeneration and to forgive sin is a wicked usurpation of divine authority,* its worship of bread and wine and its prayers to the Virgin Mary and the saints are idolatry; † and its pretense that the *ecclesia docens* cannot teach error in faith or morals involves the awful assumption that sinful men are equal to God in some of his attributes.

Such a system seems far enough from the true religion of Christ and the teaching and spirit of the New Testament. And yet it claims to be in entire accord with the Scriptures as infallibly interpreted, though it was not founded thereon,‡ but by Christ and his apostles before the gospels were committed to writing, in order that there might be an authority to decide, without possibility of error, what Scripture is divinely inspired, and what is the true interpretation thereof. There is in this, and indeed in most of the doctrines held by the Church of Rome, a germ of truth. There was a Christian community before there was a written word. The apostles built on the spoken word, and, by divine guidance, gave it to the world in the gospels and epistles; but what does not appear is that to this community as an ecclesiastical organism was given supreme and infallible authority to perpetuate the spoken, and to define and distinguish the written, word.§ The Acts and the epistles do not indicate a sacramental and sacerdotal ecclesiasticism; nor does the recently discovered sub-apostolic document, the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," give it any support. On the

* Father Curci, who is still a Roman priest, in his "*Il Vaticano Regio*," (1883,) asks the Church "to replace Jesus Christ in the chief place which belongs to him in the conscience, the love, and the hopes of the Christian peoples." He laments the neglect of the Redeemer in Roman Catholic preaching and teaching, and the multiplication of "new saints, new madonnas, new miracles, and new revelations," and declares that "if this overwhelming number of saints and madonnas is to obliterate Jesus Christ" from his mind, then he will thrust them from him and "cling only to Jesus." See "British Quarterly Review," for April, 1884.

† The attributing of a "divine nature to purely human things" is "idolatry."—*Ibid.*

‡ The Church was "not founded by Holy Writ, but already existed before its several parts appeared."—Moehler's "Symbolism," p. 290.

§ It is pretended that the apostles transmitted the canon of Scripture, as defined by the Council of Trent, to the Church, which preserved it by tradition and infallibly declared it. "Symbolism," p. 287.

contrary, it shows that down to the close of the first century or the first third of the second century there was nothing in the nature of a hierarchy, no priestly office or prerogative, and no sacramentalism. The Roman doctrine of Church authority developed in a later age* with the evolution, from the simplicity of apostolic usages, of a hierarchy, and is like a pyramid standing on its apex, the last and largest deposit on the upturned base being papal infallibility.†

The whole Roman system is a logical necessity of this dogma of authority, which became dominant when councils began to enforce their decrees with the damnatory phrase, "*Anathema sit.*" One of the earliest necessities which this developing principle of absolutism imposed on the Church was the control of the text, the interpretation, and the use of the Bible. The free and independent study of the Bible, even by the priesthood, would have led to doubt and defection, and if appeal to the Book whose author is God, as the Church itself taught, had been allowed, a higher authority than the Church would have been recognized. The exaltation of tradition was a powerful means of supporting the Church's claim. To take the position that the Bible was only a part of God's revelation, that the unwritten part was of equal if not greater importance,‡ and that this deposit of faith was solely with the Church, was part of her consciousness,§ and could therefore only be known

* Dr. Edwin Hatch, Bampton lecturer in 1880, on "The Organization of the Early Christian Churches," in an article in the June (1884) "Contemporary Review," discussing the claim of the Anglican sacerdotal party that they are reviving the pre-Constantinian Church, says if this could be done fully, not only would the Church of England lose its wealth, its crown provinces, and its lay tribunals, "it would cease to be a single body, and would be only a mass of congregations which might or might not agree to act together; it would have neither parishes nor provinces nor metropolitans; it would have no common rules of discipline, nor common order of ritual; and, what is far more important, not having any common formula of belief, the officers of its communities would have to meet again in assembly, as the officers of the communities of the fourth century met at Nicæa, to agree upon a creed."

† "It would of course be a monstrous anachronism were we to attribute a belief in papal infallibility to the ante-Nicene fathers. Our contention simply is that the *modern* doctrine on papal power is the logical outcome of patristic principles."—"Catholic Dictionary," p. 674.

‡ Catholics affirm an "unwritten word of God over and above Scripture."—"Catholic Dictionary," p. 80.

§ "Symbolism," p. 286, 287.

as the Church authoritatively imparted it—was to place in the way of independent investigation an insuperable difficulty. The Bible must not be put in general circulation. This was not the doctrine of the fathers,* but it occurred to the popes of the Middle Ages that the Waldensian and other rebellions against the authority of the Church were caused by the study of the Bible and they laid interdicts against it.† "It is only surprising," a Catholic authority‡ naïvely tells us, "that any rational being could have thought it possible for the Holy See to assume any other attitude."

The denial of the Bible to the laity involves the proposition, that it is not necessary for them to read the word of God. Pope Clement XI. condemned the notion that the "reading of Scripture is for all,"§ and numerous authorities, even as late as the "Catholic Dictionary," support his view. "Butler's Catechism" says the clergy are required to read the Scriptures, "but there is no such general obligation incumbent on the laity, it being sufficient that they listen to it from their pastors." In answer to the question whether it is "lawful for the laity to read the Holy Scriptures," it says:

> They may read them in the language in which they were written, as likewise in the ancient Vulgate Translation, which the Church vouches to be authentic. They may also read them in approved modern versions; but with due submission to the interpretation and authority of the Church.

"Numberless heresies and impieties," it goes on to say, "as also many rebellions and civil wars," have resulted from "an unrestricted reading of the Bible in the vulgar languages, by the unlearned and the unstable." Archbishop Gibbons boldly declares that Christ did not intend the Bible to be disseminated, but that the Gospel should be promulgated by preaching

* "In early times the Bible was read freely by the lay people, and the fathers constantly encouraged them to do so, although they also insist on the obscurity of the text. No prohibitions were issued against the popular reading of the Bible." —"Catholic Dictionary," p. 82.

† "The Councils of Toulouse (1229) and Tarragona (1234) forbade the laity to read the vernacular translations of the Bible. Pius IV. required the bishops to refuse lay persons leave to read even Catholic versions," and Leo XII., Pius VIII., and Pius IX. in the present century, have warned Catholics against Protestant Bibles.—*Ibid.*

‡ "Catholic Dictionary," p. 82. § *Ibid.*

alone.* He also holds, in common with other Catholic doctors, that the Bible "does not contain all the truths necessary to salvation." †

How completely the word of God is subordinated to the authority of the Church, is indicated by the remark of Augustine: "I would not believe the Gospel, if the authority of the Church did not move me thereto." According to Moehler,‡ Catholic theologians hold "that even a scriptural proof in favor of a decree held to be infallible is not itself infallible, but only the dogma as defined," by which he means that only what the Church definitely declares infallible is so to be held, that is, the Church's sense of Scripture. The Church alone, therefore, can interpret Scripture: "No one can appeal either to Scripture or to history against her definition without making shipwreck of the faith and forfeiting the name of Catholic by the very act." § No intellectual or historical difficulty is to prevent the acceptance of the Church's definition. When she declares the dogma of the Immaculate Conception every Catholic is bound, not only to accept it, ‖ but to believe that it was revealed to the apostles and "preserved in the deposit of faith, as contained in Scripture and tradition." ¶

Such is the bearing of the dogma of Church authority on the word of God. A human institution subordinates to its fallible judgment the infallible revelation of the Lord Almighty. The divine light, which shines clear and free from the pages of Holy Writ direct to the waiting individual heart, Rome dares to intercept and transmit through an imperfect medium which distorts its rays and quenches their illuminating power and makes them fallible and false. Can it for a moment be regarded as reasonable, or possible, that God should give, through divine inspiration, the law of life and death, and not intend that every soul should have free access to it? Were

* "Faith of our Fathers," p. 101, also index. † *Ibid.*, p. 111.

‡ "Symbolism," p. 290. § "Catholic Dictionary," p. 178.

‖ "We cannot be real Catholics if we do not, from our heart, accept the matters which she [the Church] puts forward as divine and true."—Cardinal Newman, in "Nineteenth Century," for Feb., 1884.

¶ "Catholic Dictionary," p. 177. Alzog ("Church History," Cincinnati, Robert Clarke & Co., 1874, vol. i, p. 362,) says: "Tradition, being the only *adequate exponent of the doctrine of Christ*, [his italics,] is, therefore, the only competent and legitimate interpreter of the Scriptures."

Christ's words addressed to a hierarchy, and not to universal humanity? Could the common people who heard him gladly understand nothing of his words? Is the Gospel, which was meant to be "good tidings" to all, addressed only to the understanding of learned ecclesiastics? These questions can be answered affirmatively only by changing the character of the Bible, robbing it of its simplicity as a revelation, and reading into its text thoughts which God never inspired. The truths of the Bible comes as a bright light into the sin-darkened soul, and can be as certainly appreciated and enjoyed as the light of the sun. "The argument to the contrary," says Dr. Hodge,* "is an insult to the understanding of the whole world of Bible readers."

On the basis of its authority over the Scriptures and over the faith of believers, the Church assumes to bar the way to salvation, except on the conditions which it lays down. How terrible from the Catholic point of view the interdicts which the infallible popes so frequently laid on whole nations, shutting them out of heaven and permitting them, despite their cry for the saving ordinances of the Church, to be swept into hell, because of the crime or contumacy of prince or king! It puts its own construction on the doctrines of grace, and claims that God has committed the means of grace to its custody, and cannot, or does not, regenerate, sanctify, and save, except through its ministry. The only door into the Church is by baptism, the only way to heaven is by the Church. This ordinance is the visible means of an invisible regeneration, and remits all sin, original and actual, and all penalties due for sin, "bestows sanctifying grace and infused virtues," imprints an indelible mark or character on the soul, and makes the recipient a member of Christ.† This result must invariably follow in infants who cannot put a bar in the way of sacramental grace: and all adults receive the "character" if they simply submit to the ordinance, even without attrition for sin, and may subsequently receive all the graces by supplying "the requisite dispositions."‡ No one who studies the Scriptures, free from the shackles of Church authority and constrained interpretation, finds such a doctrine of regeneration taught in them. We do not read that Christ said, "Come unto *the visible Church*, all ye that labor

* "Outlines of Theology." New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1879, p. 86.
† "Catholic Dictionary," p. 62. ‡ *Ibid.*

and are heavy laden, and ye shall find rest *in the ordinance of baptism;*" nor "All that the Father giveth me shall come to *the Church;* and him that cometh unto *the Church* shall not be cast out;" nor "Ask of *the Church*, and it shall be given you;" nor "Behold I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice, and *receiveth the baptism at the hands of the Church*," etc. Nor do we read in Acts that "Whosoever shall *receive the baptism of the Church* shall be saved." The reply of Catholic theologians to this would doubtless be, in the words of Moehler, (quoted on page 725,) that the "visible Church is the Son of God himself." By such ingenious methods do they make the garment of Church authority cover all difficulties and doubts.

The believer having entered on the Christian life by baptismal regeneration must, the Church teaches, prepare for the sacrament of confirmation, which can only be imparted by the bishop, and which, worthily received, that is, by those not in a state of mortal sin, "makes strong and perfect Christians." The Church has also instituted the sacrament of penance, by which the priest forgives the sins committed after baptism, whether they be mortal or venial. The individual makes confession to the priest of all his sins, and the latter as a "judge whose office it is to pass sentence of pardon," * imposes certain exercises or good offices as a satisfaction for them. This penance enjoined by the priest, who can "discern between sin and sin," having for this purpose the "science of God," of the saints, and of self-knowledge,† may not always be sufficient to satisfy for the sins committed, wherefore what is "wanting may be supplied by indulgences and our own penitential endeavors," which "release from canonical penance" enjoined by the Church, and "also remit the temporary punishments with which God often visits our sins, and which must be suffered in this life or the next, unless canceled by indulgences, by act of penance, or other good works." ‡ Of the other sacraments, except the eucharist, it is not necessary to speak.

* "The Faith of our Fathers," p. 445. Cardinal Manning (in "The Eternal Priesthood") says: "Each bishop, in his throne surrounded by his priests, judicially binding or loosing the souls of men, by the power of the keys, is the judge of arbitration to avert the judgment of the last day."—P. 31.

† "The Eternal Priesthood," p. 31. ‡ "Butler's Catechism," p. 53.

Suffice it to say, that they are intended to provide all needful graces in life, the priest or the bishop being the indispensable instrument. It is not needful to show, even to a cursory reader of the Scriptures, how little in harmony all this is with God's teaching. "If we confess our sins, he [Christ, not the priest] is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." * But, it may be asked, does not the Catholic Church admit that private confession is permissible? Archbishop Gibbons says:

> Forgiveness of sin is ordinarily to be obtained only through the ministry of the apostles and their successors, just as it was from them that the people were to receive the word of God and baptism. The pardoning power was a great prerogative conferred on the apostles. But what kind of a prerogative would it be if people could always obtain forgiveness by confessing to God secretly in their rooms? How few would have recourse to the apostles if they could obtain forgiveness on easier terms! †

The doctrine of the mass is another perversion of scriptural teaching and a necessity of the dogma of Church authority. No other feature of the Roman system is better understood than this, and I need not stop to explain it. It is held to confer grace in common with the other sacraments, *ex opere operato*. In effect it is a species of idolatry, supreme adoration being paid to a circular piece of bread under the delusion that it is Christ, that it becomes so at the command of the celebrant, and that it must ever remain so. This monstrous idea leads to the observance of minute rules with regard to the handling and reception of the bread and wine, which seem, to the really reverent, shocking in their gross significance, and a degradation of a spiritual ‡ act of deep import.§ Christ said as oft as ye do this do it in *remembrance* of me; but Catholics

* 1 John i, 9. † "The Faith of our Fathers," p. 392.

‡ Canon VIII of the Council of Trent says: "If any one saith that Christ, given in the eucharist, is eaten spiritually only, and not also sacramentally and really, let him be anathema."

§ The "Short Catechism," Baltimore, tells the communicant how to hold the mouth and lips, and adds: "We should not be disturbed if the host adhere to the palate, but should endeavor to loosen it gently with the tongue, and by no means to touch it with our fingers. It is also proper not to spit for some minutes after communion." The Roman missal tells what is to be done in case the Lord's Supper is disgorged.

offer it as a sacrifice to God. Their catechisms speak of it as "continuing the bloody sacrifice of the cross," offered, among other reasons, in "order to obtain pardon for our sins," and the Canons of Trent are most explicit on this point. They deny that it is simply a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a commemoration of the sacrifice on the cross, and assert that it is a "propitiatory sacrifice," to be offered for the living and for the dead, "for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities of the faithful." This affects in a very important way the great doctrine of the atonement, which, soteriologically, is set forth both in Protestant and Catholic symbols without essential differences. But the Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass and of penance implies—nay, it logically compels—the belief that the sacrifice of the cross was an incomplete atonement. Moehler's discussion * of this subject comprehends Christ's ministry, sufferings, and "perpetual condescension" in the eucharist in one great sacrificial act in expiation of our sins, "consisting, indeed, of various individual parts; yet so that none by itself is, strictly speaking, the sacrifice." Therefore without the sacrifice of the mass "the other parts would not have sufficed for our complete atonement." Nevertheless, the sacrifice of the cross yields, as they hold, a superabundance of merits which constitute a treasury whose riches are available to the Church, and which is increased by the supererogatory works of the saints and others of the faithful. Human ingenuity cannot go farther, nor could it more signally defeat itself. Holy Writ leaves no possible doubt that the sacrifice of the cross, "once offered," cannot and hath no need to be repeated, "for by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified," and "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins." † The dogma of the authority of the Church, however, requires such perversions of truth to establish and maintain its tyranny over conscience. If the Church admitted that grace could be obtained except through its channels, or that the atonement made for all mankind was so far completed on Calvary that all, without the Church's sacrifice and agency, are free to embrace its benefits, it would not, indeed, make itself unnecessary, but it would abdicate its claim to supreme and exclusive authority.

* "Symbolism," p. 232. † Hebrews x, 14, 26.

There is much to be commended in the zeal which Catholics show in devotion. They are exhorted to meditation and prayer at all hours and in all places, and nothing is more common than the use of the beads and other aids to devotion. The Catholic, however, does not hold that prayer is either the chief act of worship or the chief means of grace. The "one worship really worthy of him [God] is the sacrifice of the mass," * and "the sacraments are the most powerful means of grace." † But we will not dwell on this error, which not a few nominal Protestants accept as truth. It is far more important to consider how generally prayer has become in Catholic usage a machine performance, and how small a proportion of it is addressed directly to God. Prayer is among the good works enjoined in penance, and often among the conditions on which indulgences are granted. The saying of the Lord's Prayer and the Hail Mary, or prayer to the Virgin, a certain number of times constitutes an act of piety with merits attached. The rosary, which is intended to be to the faithful what the breviary is to the priesthood, is an incontestable proof of the value attached to the "saying" of these prayers in repetition. For every ten small beads on a rosary there is one large bead, and for every bead there is a prayer: the "Hail Mary" for each small bead, and the Lord's Prayer for each large one. Every full rosary means a hundred and fifty repetitions of the prayer to the Virgin, and fifteen repetitions of the Lord's Prayer. In how many cases such performances are "vain repetitions," which our Lord condemned, it is not necessary or desirable to inquire; but the tendency of the teaching that God is pleased and real merits are acquired thereby must be to degrade the highest and holiest form of spiritual communion with God to a formal, mechanical exercise. "True worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth; for the Father seeketh such to worship him." ‡ This degradation of the lofty spirit and character of prayer is made painfully evident in the manuals and devotional books which fill so large a place in Catholic literature. There are books of devotion to St. Joseph, to the Blessed Virgin, to the "Holy Face;" and manuals of the "Holy Name," the "Immaculate Heart of Mary," "Our Lady of Perpetual Help," the "Sacred Heart,"

* "Catholic Dict.," p. 175. † "Butler's Catechism," p. 45. ‡ John iv, 23.

the "Child Jesus," the "Holy Angels," of the "Confraternity of the Sacred Thirst and Agony of Jesus," of "Our Lady of Lourdes," and so on. The grossest conceptions would appear to underlie such forms of devotion. The natural tendency of the mind is toward the material, and when the spiritualizing teachings of the Scriptures are denied their legitimate effects, and mere objects of sense are exalted, there must follow a lowering of the spiritual tone of worship. It is not strange that the mind which has been trained in this school of devotion should have an inclination to add to the objects of its worship. God is represented as a spirit, to be worshiped as a spirit in spirit and in truth. Minds accustomed to a low plane of spiritual worship crave mediators through whom they may approach the awful majesty of the Lord Almighty, and whose powerful influence may plead for them. It was this which caused the famous treatise on the "Celestial Hierarchy," purporting to be the work of a disciple of St. Paul, to be received with so much favor in the Middle Ages.* Below the Primal Deity it put three descending triads, the lowest in power and glory being nearest man, and the highest nearest God. It is this which delights to honor the saints and the angels, and to seek their powerful intercession. Catholics claim to observe distinctions in the worship which they pay to celestial beings. The highest, latria, is paid to God alone, as in the adoration of the host in the mass; the lowest, dulia, is paid to saints and angels; while the transcendent merits of the Blessed Virgin are honored by hyperdulia. We will not stop to inquire how accurately the masses of worshipers may be able in practice to observe these distinctions. It is enough that prayers are offered which are not addressed to the triune God. We have seen that the prayer to the Virgin comes on the rosary ten times where the Lord's Prayer comes once, and it always follows the latter, says "Butler's Catechism," in order that "by her intercession we may more easily obtain what we ask for in the Lord's Prayer." In the "*confiteor*" which all the faithful use constantly, confession is made to "Almighty God, to the Blessed Mary ever Virgin, to blessed Michael the archangel, to blessed John the Baptist, to the holy apostles Peter and Paul, and to all saints;" and the Virgin, the Baptist, the

* See Milman's "Latin Christianity," vol. viii, pp. 190–196.

archangel, and the apostles and saints are besought to pray to the Lord on behalf of the suppliant; and a prayer, recommended for use in the "Short Catechism," begs the patronage of the Virgin and asks her to "deliver us from all dangers." No one can deny that it is lawful to pray to saints without incurring the "anathema" of the Church. She whose boast is *semper eadem* has put the stamp of her authority on this shocking doctrine and made it a perpetual error.

The scope of this article permits but one more example of the grave errors which the dogma of Church authority involves. If the Church cannot err in matters of faith and morals, and all men must listen to her voice, and submit to her authority in order to be saved, the faithful can and must put their consciences to rest as to her teachings. If the believer yields implicit obedience, believing what she tells him to believe as truth, denying what she tells him to deny as error, his conscience must be held to be guiltless. The Church assumes for him all responsibility of ascertaining all religious and moral truth necessary for him to know. His conscience is only bound to unquestioning acceptance and implicit obedience. He sees that holiness is inherent in the Church as an institution,* and that by becoming a faithful member he becomes a partaker of that holiness. The Church furnishes a spiritual judge to examine his conscience, to grant him remission, to impose penance, and, in short, to take in charge the welfare of his soul. With an infallible pope and council to define truth, and a plenipotentiary priesthood to impart it and confer the divine graces necessary to salvation, there is sufficient reason for a settled conscience and no motive to sin against the Church and against God by doubt.

He who would be a good Catholic, therefore, cannot be an independent investigator of religious truth. We have quoted, on another page, a statement of Mgr. Capel, which reflects the

* This doctrine would repay, if there were space for it, a careful examination. Consider it, for example, in connection with this admission by Moehler: "Doubtless examples enough can be alleged of priests, bishops, and popes who in the most unconscionable and unjustifiable manner have failed to discharge their duty when it was quite in their power to bring about a reform in morals, or who by their own scandalous conduct and lives have extinguished the still glimmering torch which they ought to have kindled. Hell hath swallowed them up."—"Symbolism," p. 270.

teaching of the Church in these words: "To doubt willfully any one article of faith, or to enter on the examination of any dogma with the intention of suspending belief until the conclusion of such examination, would be for a Catholic a deadly sin." The atmosphere of our free America has made this a difficulty, even for Catholics. An Englishman, writing for a Catholic periodical * his impressions of American Catholicism, mentions the independence of the American character as "prejudicial to Catholicity." "American notions" have to be set aside in Church matters. This the American "resents," and his "independence of mind has a tendency to force its way into a sphere where independence is inadmissible."

I cannot forbear to put over against this doctrine, which obstructs God's revelation, bars human progress, and seals up all truth, a few sentences by that Samson of the Reformation who broke loose from this bondage and freed the world, Martin Luther:

> When Christ calls upon his people to beware of false prophets he recognizes not the right of the pope or the councils, but that of all Christians, to decide upon doctrine. . . . No one can command the soul unless he knows how to direct its way to heaven. This no man can do but God alone. Therefore in matters that concern the salvation of the soul nothing but the word of God is to be taught and received. . . . Every man believes as he believes at his own peril, and must see to it that his faith be right. For as little as another can descend into hell or ascend into heaven for me, so little can he believe or not believe for me. †

There have been some pitiable cases of submission to error where there was knowledge of the truth, because the authority of the Church permitted no alternative. What words could indicate more abject dependence than these: "The pope has no rival in his claims upon us. . . . If we give him up, to whom shall we go? Can I put my soul into the hands of our gracious sovereign, or of the Archbishop of Canterbury?" ‡ This is not the utterance of an ignorant slave, but of the most brilliant mind of the Roman Catholic Church, John Henry Newman, Cardinal.

* "The Month," vol. xxxii, pp. 357–373.

† Sprecher's "Groundwork of Lutheran Theology," 1879, pp. 87, 88.

‡ "Answer to Gladstone," p. 52.

ART. VIII.—BIBLICAL HERMENEUTICS.

Biblical Hermeneutics. A Treatise on the Interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. By MILTON S. TERRY, S. T. D. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Walden & Stowe. 1883.

THE position of the Bible in the history of the world is unique. It belongs to no one age. It is the property of no one nation. It is pre-eminently "The Book for all Times and for all Peoples." It has been translated into most of the languages of this many-tongued earth, and no sooner does it become known than it lays a spell on the people, attracting many readers, and completely changing the current of their thought and the character of their lives. This book never grows old. The most "advanced thought" never leaves it behind. It is as fully adapted to the people of the nineteenth century as to those who handled with reverence the papyrus or the parchment on which the first editions of its various parts were written. The study of its pages has given birth to thousands of volumes in the past. Many of those volumes are ranked among the choicest treasures of earth's literature to-day. The publication of Dr. Terry's work is convincing demonstration that the interest in the study of the book has not abated.

What is the secret of this lasting interest in this book? It contains some of the most ancient records of our race. No writer can treat on the early history of man without referring to its pages. Of all ancient documents its statements are the most reliable. On many of the things related we have no light from any other sources. As its narratives bring us into connection with the times and events chronicled by other historians, they are found to be accurate in the main, and where apparent discrepancies are presented, careful investigation and fuller information remove the discrepancy, or indicate that the statements of this book are more accurate than the histories with which they are compared. Modern discoveries have afforded convincing evidence of its singular accuracy on some points in which it had been supposed to be inaccurate. Where its statements are still called in question, as in the story of the creation, theories alone, not attested history, are placed in opposition to it, and most thoughtful students will admit that the

biblical narrative affords at least as rational an account of creation as any cosmogony yet presented for the acceptance of mankind, and one that in its details is at least as "thinkable" as any modern atheistic conception of creation.

The position of the book in the literature of the world is not less peculiar. It contains the earliest specimens of many styles of composition. We have alluded to its history. Portions of that were written more than a thousand years before Herodotus, who was regarded by the Greeks as the father of history. "The lyric poetry of the Hebrews was in its golden age nearly a thousand years before the birth of Horace. Deborah sang a model of a triumphal song full five hundred years before Sappho was born. The author of Ecclesiastes discussed the problem of evil five hundred years before Socrates in the Dialogues of Plato. The epithalamium of the Canticles is nearly a thousand years older than Ovid's "Art of Love." The Book of Esther was a venerable fragment of biography, more strange than fiction, at least twelve hundred years old, at the dawn of the romantic literature of Europe. The Proverbs of Solomon are by eight hundred years more ancient than the treatises of Seneca."*

The antiquity of the book entitles it to a distinguished place in human literature. But this is not its chief claim to attention. Apart from its history and its literature, its treasures are inestimable. It touches on the most important interests of man. It professes to come to him from God, and to impart to him light on subjects which he admits to be of the greatest moment to him—subjects which he cannot keep from his thoughts, which are necessarily related to his nature. It tells him about God, his own spiritual nature, of life beyond the grave, and of a future judgment. It tells him of sin—its nature and terrible consequences; and unfolds to him the method of salvation, offering its teachings as a guide to peace of conscience and everlasting happiness. It comes as a code of morals, setting forth what God requires, and demanding man's obedience: its very claims force it into notice. No man can afford to neglect such a book: it challenges attention. Hence in every age it has engaged the thought of men, and drawn out some of the most gifted minds in the study

* Phelps, "Men and Books."

of its pages. At the present day the interest in the study of these Scriptures is greatly quickened. The character and claims of the Book are investigated with a clearness and a wealth of scholarship never previously brought to bear on any other book. This is not a sign of lessened respect for its teachings, or of diminished confidence in its authority. On the contrary, the searching examinations to which these records are subjected attest in the strongest manner that men feel that the contents of the book supply some reasonable basis for the claims put forth on behalf of its divine origin, and make it their duty and interest to do all they can to ascertain and understand what is the foundation on which these claims rest.

Hence men desire to possess the very words of the authors of the several portions of this wondrous book. The study of the sacred text has developed into a science. Borne on by a noble enthusiasm, specialists in this department of sacred literature have sought for early manuscripts of the Scriptures as men hunt for concealed treasures. The story of their adventures while in pursuit of the object of their quest has, not inaptly, been called "the romance of the manuscripts." As the result of their persistent toil in ferreting out ancient copies of the sacred books, scanning with care those manuscripts when found, comparing the various readings presented, weighing the evidence on which each reading rests, as cautiously as the merchant weighs the finest gold, and selecting that which comes forth from the testing furnace most approved, the labors of such men as Mill, Bentley, Bengel, Wetstein, Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Scrivener, Westcott and Hort, have, in all probability, secured for the present age, a text nearer to the very words written by the inspired penmen than it has been permitted any age of the Church from the days of the apostles to possess.

The importance attached to these labors is evinced by the interest excited by the publication of the Revised Version of the New Testament. The demand for that work was unprecedented. The execution of the work has been severely criticised. Some of those criticisms are undoubtedly deserved. This is but to admit that the work is not perfect. When all reasonable deductions for these blemishes have been made, the work of the revisers stands forth as a noble contribution to

biblical science. The most prejudiced of intelligent biblical scholars, if asked by one whose limited education confines him to a translation into the English language, in what book he would find the most correct representation of the original text of the Testament, could scarcely hesitate to reply, "Read the Revised Version." The debt of students of the Bible to the men who have devoted their time and energies to the study of textual criticism is incalculable.

Having obtained a correct text, the next thing to be sought for is to ascertain the correct meaning of that text. This, and nothing but this, is the word of God. We may have the very words in which the oracle was uttered, yet those words may prove not merely useless but even misleading, unless they are correctly interpreted. It is essential to a correct understanding that the precise meaning of the words be known. Hence the importance of a suitable lexicon. We have several lexicons of the Hebrew language, and not a few devoted specially to New Testament Greek. It is in this department that the student of Scripture encounters one of his most serious difficulties. Christianity as a new revelation created a vocabulary peculiarly its own. Its heralds introduced some new words. But, for the most part; they employed words already in use, imparting to them a new, richer, fuller meaning, ennobling the words by their adoption into the language of the kingdom. The compiler of such a lexicon as is needed must give full attention to what has been happily designated "the language-molding power of Christianity." Perhaps it would not be going too far to say, that the greatest desideratum to the student of the New Testament at the present time is a really good lexicon of New Testament Greek. The biblical scholar who will furnish such a work will confer a lasting benefit on many, and one that will encourage not a few to study the Greek text with more persistent earnestness.

The grammatical peculiarities of New Testament Greek are not few. The very genesis of the dialect, and the circumstances of the authors, necessitated this. A knowledge of those peculiarities will be a great help to the interpreter of the sacred text. In this department, if we are not yet furnished with all that we could desire, we have very valuable help in the grammars of Winer and Buttmann, especially as they have

been annotated in the translations into English by Thayer and Moulton.

A further help to a correct interpretation will be found in the knowledge of the personal history and character of the writer of each book, the circumstances of those to whom he wrote, the particular object he had in view, and the time and place in which he wrote. This age is rich in treatises on Old and New Testament "introduction," or in monographs in which all that is needful in the case of separate books is abundantly supplied. These cannot be safely left unnoticed by any person who aims at a correct interpretation of the oracles of God.

These appliances supply the material on which the interpreter has to try his skill, and the tools which he is to employ in his noble work. Hermeneutics comes to his aid when he is thus furnished; points out his work, teaches him how to do that work, and drills him in the use of his tools.

In the following quotation Dr. Terry states with clearness and fullness the aim of Hermeneutics, and carefully points out the difference between several departments of sacred literature:

> Hermeneutics aims to establish the principles, methods, and rules which are needful to unfold the sense of what is written. Its object is to elucidate whatever may be obscure or ill-defined, so that every reader may be able, by an intelligent process, to obtain the exact ideas intended by the author. Exegesis is the application of these principles and laws, the actual bringing out into formal statements, and by other terms, the meaning of the author's words. Exegesis is related to hermeneutics as preaching is to homiletics, or, in general, as practice is to theory. Exposition is another word often used synonymously with exegesis, and has essentially the same signification; and yet, perhaps, in common usage, exposition denotes more extended development and illustration on the sense, dealing more largely with other Scriptures by comparison and contrast. We observe, accordingly, that the writer on Biblical Introduction examines the historical foundations and canonical authority of the books of Scripture. The textual critic detects interpolations, emends false readings, and aims to give us the very words which the sacred writers used. The exegete takes up these words, and by means of the principles of hermeneutics, defines their meaning, elucidates the scope and plan of each writer, and brings forth the grammatico-historical sense of what each book contains. The expositor builds upon the labors both of critics and exegetes, and sets forth in fuller

form, and by ample illustration, the ideas, doctrines, and moral lessons of the Scripture.—Pages 19, 20.

To the science of Biblical Hermeneutics Dr. Terry's book is a very valuable and a very timely contribution. It is clear in the statement of principles, full in the elucidation of them, independent in tone, and almost prodigal in the free outpouring of the acquisitions of a scholarship that is at once wide and accurate. If the library of which this work forms a volume be made up of works of equal merit, the distinguished editors may rejoice in the consciousness that they have given to the Church the most valuable contribution to theological science that has ever been issued by the press of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The first part of the book is devoted to an "Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics." It would be somewhat difficult to show how all the topics discussed in this introduction fall naturally within the compass of a treatise on Hermeneutics. Considering that the work is intended as one volume of a library of Biblical and Theological Literature, the varied contents of this volume would suggest the fear that the province of some other writer, or even writers, must be intruded on. Some will think, from the extent of the volume, that the book would have been improved by the omission of some of the chapters. Still, few who read them attentively will wish that they had been omitted. They contain much valuable information on subjects cognate to the theme of the book, and afford ample evidence of the extensive reading of the author. The first chapter closes with a forceful setting forth of the rank and importance of Hermeneutics in Theological Science, and points out the vital importance of the study to the Christian preacher:

The great work of the Christian ministry is to preach the word; and that most important labor cannot be effectually done without a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures and skill in the interpretation and application of the same. Personal piety and practical godliness are nourished by the study of the written word. . . . The apostle Paul admonished Timothy that the Holy Scriptures were able to make him wise unto salvation through faith in Jesus Christ. And Jesus himself, interceding for his own chosen followers, prayed, "Sanctify them in the truth, thy word is truth." Accordingly, the Lord's embassador must not adulterate, but rightly divide, the word of the truth. For if ever the divinely

appointed ministry of reconciliation accomplish the perfecting of the saints and the building up of the body of Christ so as to bring all to the attainment of the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, it must be done by a correct interpretation and efficient use of the word of God. The interpretation and application of that word must rest upon a sound and self-evidencing science of Hermeneutics.—Page 22.

It is refreshing to the spirit to meet with such a statement of the relation of the office of preaching to the interpretation of the sacred Scriptures. When this is recognized by the preachers of the Gospel generally there will be more attention devoted to "give the sense (of the book) and cause them (the people) to understand the reading." Then may we look for a more consistent, because a more enlightened, piety.

The third chapter treats of the languages of the Bible. We shall not follow the author into the discussion of the origin and growth of language. The chapter is fruitful in tempting themes, but they seem to draw the reader away from the subject of Hermeneutics. The opening utterance of the chapter challenges attention. Dr. Terry says:

A thorough acquaintance with the genius and grammatical structure of the original languages of the Bible is essentially the basis of all sound interpretation. A translation, however faithful, is itself an interpretation, and cannot be safely made a substitute for original and independent investigation. As an introduction, therefore, to Biblical Hermeneutics, it is of the first importance that we have a knowledge of those ancient tongues in which the sacred oracles were written.—Page 69.

It is not necessary here to discuss the question: Is any man qualified to act as an authorized public interpreter of Scripture who lacks this knowledge of the languages in which the Scriptures were written? There would necessarily be a wide difference in the answers given to the question, and the answers on both sides would be sustained by arguments not to be lightly disregarded. All will probably agree that an embassador ought, if possible, to be able to read his commission and credentials in the language in which they were written, and not rest satisfied to receive them at second-hand. The passage quoted is worthy of deep consideration, especially by young ministers, and students preparing for the ministry. The first stages in the attempt to acquire a really helpful knowledge of

the original languages of Scripture are comparatively uninviting and dull. Few students leave college sufficiently masters of Greek to read the New Testament in the original with ease and pleasure. Fewer still have made the peculiarities of New Testament Greek a special study. Many leave college without acquiring even the elements of Hebrew. Of the theological students who, in the seminary, nominally pursue a three-years' course in that language, very few make any real use of it in after life. One chief reason of this may be found in the difficulty which they experience in *reading* the original text. It would be well in all colleges and theological schools in which Hebrew is taught to devote so much time to the study in the first year as would enable the careful student to read the text aloud as correctly, fluently, and readily as English is read. While a child has to spell out every second word, and even then is not certain that he is correct, he is not likely to read extensively for pleasure. Many who have devoted their time and energy cheerfully to the study of Hebrew when preparing for the work of the ministry have found their labor and time unremunerative from the simple fact that the want of skill in reading the text made the work a perfect drudgery. If the minister's chief function be to expound and apply the Holy Scriptures, and if the teaching of Dr. Terry be correct, the student who is endeavoring to secure an education which may help to make him a workman who needeth not to be ashamed, must make up his mind to overcome every obstacle, and become so far a master of the original languages of the Scriptures as to read them with fluency and with a goodly measure of critical skill.

In the ninth chapter the author returns to the subject of Hermeneutics, and considers the qualifications of an interpreter. These are presented as intellectual—largely native to the soul; educational—acquired by study and research; and spiritual—which may be regarded both as native and acquired. There is some danger of losing sight of the last, while considering the first and second classes of qualifications. And yet, valuable as intellectual and educational qualifications unquestionably are, the spiritual qualifications must always remain the most important to the interpreter of Scripture. How instructive on this point are the words of a recent writer:

An object can only be seen by some appropriate faculty to which it naturally appeals. We must be mathematically minded to make the highest attainments in mathematics; poetically minded to have insight into the things of poetry; scientifically minded to know the deep things of natural science; spiritually minded to know the things of the Spirit. Holiness alone can understand holiness. "Without holiness no man can see the Lord," in his works or in his word, either in earth or in heaven. Without holiness you may, indeed, understand Hebrew as well as Caiaphas did; Latin as well as Pilate did; the Greek as well as that Athenian did who charged Paul with setting forth "strange gods;" the geography and antiquities of Palestine as perfectly as the proudest Pharisee that ever wore phylacteries; but God's book will be a sealed book to you; and though you may have a grammatical knowledge of the words which reveal holy things, you will never know the things themselves. For "the natural man perceiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned;" while "he that is spiritual judgeth all things." Well might Augustine say: "The *heart* is the true theologian;" for, from the nature of things, as well as from the sovereign declaration of the Great Teacher, we learn that only "the pure in heart shall see God."*

Few will rise from the study of this chapter without feeling "Who is sufficient for these things?"

The second and most important part of the work treats of the "Principles of Biblical Hermeneutics." These are defined as "those governing laws and methods of procedure by which the interpreter determines the meaning of the Holy Scriptures. They are of the nature of comprehensive and fundamental doctrines. They become to the practical exegete so many maxims, postulates, and settled rules. He is supposed to hold them in his mind as axioms, and to apply them in all his expositions with uniform consistency."—P. 161. The importance of establishing sound and trustworthy principles of exposition is fully realized, and clearly stated, by the author. This is evidently felt to be the chief end of writing the book. Yet this is just the point which many interpreters of Scripture fail to see and neglect to provide for. The Bible is analogous to nature in many respects—certainly in this, that sad work has been made out of the attempt to explain the mysteries of both as the result of entering on that work without any fixed principles of interpretation, or under the control of erroneous prin-

* Stanford, "Central Truths," p. 73.

ciples. The divine origin of the Bible, as of nature, is demonstrated by its absolute inexhaustibleness. As the scientists of each succeeding generation find that the discoveries of their predecessors have left a large virgin field still untouched to invite and reward their labors, so the students of the Bible constantly find, as their eyes are opened to behold wondrous things out of God's law, that their patient toil in "ransacking" the Scriptures is ever and anon rewarded with the discovery of some gem of truth that had, up to that moment, concealed itself from the explorer's view. Men study nature and the Bible, and weary not of their work. In investigating them they find no indication of failing material. Between these two inexhaustible revelations of the same infinite Intelligence there is a marked difference; yet the points of interest in common are not few. Each unfolds what is all-important to man. In each the practically useful is closely connected with what is theoretically sound. In neither will you find the treasures on the surface. Earnest labor, diligent and persevering, is the only condition on which they will yield up their hidden treasures. When these are sought in the right way the results richly recompense the toil of the workers. Hence the evils of mistake in the methods of study are proportional to the value and importance of the results aimed at. Few chapters in the chronicles of human progress are more interesting than the story of the life-work of some of the early pioneers in investigating the secrets of nature. Their enthusiastic devotedness to their chosen pursuit calls forth our admiration. Their heroic perseverance in the midst of discouragements, and the stupendous difficulties over which they triumphed, impress us with the sense of their energy and indomitable will. Yet during many years they made little progress in the knowledge of nature. Many of the theories which they believed and taught provoke a smile at the present day; and their practical discoveries, when placed in comparison with those of the past fifty years, seem meager in the extreme. Looking back from our vantage-ground we can, without difficulty, detect some of the causes of their failure. In many cases their efforts were directed to the attainment of objects not within the field of human science. In seeking these, the most approved methods of modern investigation would have been utterly useless. The

chemist of modern science has astonished the world by his discoveries, and has enriched it by the practical application of them to the affairs of every-day life: but Faraday, Tyndall, and their fellow-laborers are just as far from discovering the philosopher's stone as the alchemist of the distant past, who consumed the energies of a life in the persistent quest of that wondrous phantom. The comparatively unfruitful outcome of their ceaseless toil is now clearly seen to have been due in many cases to their employment of methods not suitable to their work. The methods they employed could not, in the hands of any investigators, have yielded results really satisfactory. In modern times immense strides have been made in man's knowledge of the universe and its laws. Of this all are conscious. Yet as the advancement of science goes on daily around us we do not notice the changes that it is working, as we should be certain to do under other circumstances. If one of the foremost sons of science of a hundred years ago were permitted to return to the earth, he would find himself in a new world. When his astonishment would permit him to speak, he would discover that his vocabulary did not supply the words he would require to converse on subjects that are perfectly familiar to us in our every-day life. To him every thing would seem changed. Yet there has been no change in nature. No new elements have been introduced. No new principles have been set at work. The principles of nature are better understood by men, and are more wisely and more extensively applied in practice. That is all. The consequence is, all the discoveries of modern science and all the increase in the comforts and conveniences peculiar to modern civilization. Who can estimate the advantage?

The heavens declared the glory of God in the infancy of our race in accents just as loud and just as intelligible as in our day, but the voices were, in good part, unintelligible to man, because he had not yet learned in even an imperfect sense "to think God's thoughts after him." The treasures stored up in the depths of the earth, and the marvelous properties latent in the commonest things surrounding man, voiced then the tender love of our Father to his new-born children, and his matchless wisdom in providing for their ever-multiplying needs, just as distinctly as at present; but the richness of that provision, and

the adaptation of the world provided for them, were then comparatively hidden from their view, because men had not learned to unearth those treasures, or to understand and utilize those properties. Nature more scientifically studied, more correctly understood, more wisely and extensively utilized, has yielded us the clearer light and the substantial advantages which we possess as compared with the men of former times. As we exult in those possessions, and pity those who lived surrounded with the same treasures but knew it not, may we not fancy that the men of a coming age will feel a like pity for us? With all the perfection of our modern science, and the attention devoted to the methods of studying nature, is it not possible that we are living surrounded by treasures inconceivable in their vastness and their value, which shall speak to the men of ages yet to come the inexhaustible goodness of God, in accents just as clear as those in which the boundless goodness of our God now calls forth our adoring gratitude?

The Bible is a higher revelation from God of himself, and of his love to man, and his bounteous provision for his varying necessities. The blessing conferred on us by the book are even more valuable and lasting than those presented to us in nature, and, when rightly apprehended, they fully justify the statement of the apostle when he speaks of the possession of the oracles of God as the highest advantage conferred on our race. The Scriptures, wherever known, even in part, touch man's highest interests, and always for good. It is impossible to estimate aright the obligations of the world to the Bible. The human family has lost much from the errors into which the interpreters of the book have fallen in the past. Those errors have been similar to the mistakes which have limited and even marred the work of the interpreters of nature. The purpose of the book has been misapprehended. Light has been sought from it on points on which it was not designed to be a revelation. Methods have been adopted in investigating its teachings which were utterly unfitted to lead to a correct interpretation, and, in cases not a few, would-be interpreters have come to the Book, not to ascertain its teachings, but to find in it support for theories adopted without any reference to its utterances. Sad as these things are, they only show that the men were human. Their errors have not changed the character of the

Bible, or weakened its claims on the attention of men. This needs to be kept in mind. Many persons speak and write as if they thought that the mistakes of generations past in the use of the Bible, and the unwarranted conclusions forced from it, were reasons why the book itself should be discredited or neglected. As we study the expositions of the Bible that have come down to us from the ages that are past, we meet with many things that are erroneous, absurd, mischievous; but these notwithstanding, the book abides, and is still "the perfect law of liberty," able to make wise unto salvation. The erroneous doctrines and misleading conclusions of former interpreters, clearly seen now, are laid aside, just as refuted theories in natural science are discarded. These are seen to have been no part of the Bible, as the errors of the early scientists are seen to have been no part of nature; and as the modern scientist still looks to the universe around him as the source whence, and whence alone, he may hope to obtain the knowledge which he seeks, so he who has separated himself to pursue the truths that bear on the highest interests of man's nature—the spiritual and the moral—turns to the oracles of God with unbated confidence as the one great store-house in which he may find the most valuable knowledge within the reach of man on the subjects of his study. He clearly perceives the errors of his predecessors, and without difficulty traces many of them to the faulty principles of interpretation adopted in the study of the book. He wonders at the masses of rich ore which, in spite of this impediment, they were enabled to extract from this mine of inspired truth; and, arguing from the analogous history of scientific investigation, he is captivated with the picture that rises before his vision of the glorious results that await his investigation when, under the guidance of sound and carefully selected principles of interpretation, he devotes his energies to understand and make known the treasures of wisdom and of knowledge that abound in this matchless book.

Whatever others may think, the extent of the second division of the work will not be regarded by such a student as a blemish in the book. In it we meet with carefully studied expositions of parables, allegories, difficult prophetical passages, and, especially, minute and lengthy comments on the eschatological portions of the Scriptures. These may be regarded by some

as out of place in a treatise on Hermeneutics. Yet they are not to be regarded as accidents, or as so many digressions from the theme of the book. If we are guided by the familiar canon, "In every work regard the writer's aim," they will be esteemed an essential part of his plan. Thus the author says:

As the full grammar of a language establishes its principles by sufficient examples and by formal praxis, so a science of hermeneutics must needs verify and illustrate its principles by examples of their practical application. Its province is not merely to define principles and methods, but also to exemplify and illustrate them. Hermeneutics, therefore, is both a science and an art. As a science, it enunciates principles, investigates the laws of thought and language, and classifies its facts and results. As an art, it teaches what application those principles should have, and establishes their soundness by showing their practical value in the elucidation of the more difficult Scriptures. The hermeneutical art thus cultivates and establishes a valid exegetical procedure.—Page 20.

Viewed from this stand point, the expositions constitute the "praxis" of the system, illustrating the application of the principles inculcated, and the results reached by the use of them. To many readers they will constitute a chief attraction of the book; and, while some may not adopt all the principles laid down, and be further still from agreeing in every case with the expositions reached through the application of those principles, yet will they find in the illustration of the method of applying principles once adopted, and working them out carefully and conscientiously in exposition, much that will be of permanent value to them in their personal study of the sacred writings.

In entering on the statement of principles a chapter is devoted to the "Different Methods of Interpretation." The principles of the Allegorical, Mystical, Pietistic, Accommodation-Theory, Moral, Naturalistic, Mythical, Apologetic, and Dogmatic Methods of Interpretation are briefly set before the readers, with the names of leading interpreters in each school, and a specimen of their interpretation. The list closes with the Grammatico-Historical Method, of which we are told:

In distinction from all the above-mentioned methods of interpretation, we may name the Grammatico-Historical as the method which most fully commends itself to the judgment and conscience of Christian scholars. Its fundamental principle is to

gather from the Scriptures themselves the precise meaning which the writers intended to convey. It applies to the sacred books the same principles, the same grammatical process and exercise of common sense and reason, which we apply to other books. The grammatico-historical exegete, furnished with suitable qualifications, intellectual, educational, and moral, will accept the claims of the Bible without prejudice or adverse prepossession, and, with no ambition to prove them true or false, will investigate the language and import of each book with fearless independence. He will master the language of the writer, the particular dialect which he used, and his peculiar style and manner of expression. He will inquire into the circumstances under which he wrote, the manners and customs of his age, and the purpose or object which he had in view. He has a right to assume that no sensible author will be knowingly inconsistent with himself or seek to bewilder and mislead his readers.—Poge 173.

Again, (on page 210,) we read:

The grammatical sense is to be always sought by a careful study and application of the well-established principles and rules of the language. A close attention to the meaning and relations of words, a care to note the course of thought, and to allow each case, mood, tense, and the position of each word, to contribute its part to the general whole, and a caution lest we assign to words and phrases a scope and conception foreign to the *usus loquendi* of the language—these are rules which, if faithfully observed, will always serve to bring out the real import of any document.

These extracts set before us the key-note of Dr. Terry's system, the basis, approved as solid and trustworthy, on which his system rests. He has evidently studied his positions with care, and tested them in practice. Hence he feels no lack of confidence in them. He maintains them manfully, and follows them without misgiving wherever they may lead. He lays it down as a principle that "words and sentences can have but one signification in one and the same connection. The moment we neglect this principle we drift out upon a sea of uncertainty and conjecture." Applying this principle to the narratives of miraculous events, he writes:

The miracles of the Bible are recorded as facts, actual occurrences, witnessed by few or by many as the case might be, and the writers give no intimation that their statements involve any thing but plain literal truth. Even in the much-disputed story of Jephthah's daughter he abides by his canon, and says, "The sacred writer declares that, after the two months, Jephthah did to his daughter the vow *which he had vowed*—not something else which he had not vowed.

The same manly confidence in the application of principles deliberately adopted characterizes the book in discussing questions not merely of exposition, but matters belonging to other departments of sacred literature. We may select as an illustration the question as to the date of the Apocalypse. Our author lays it down as a principle of interpretation "that all due regard must be had to the person and circumstances of the author, the time and place of his writing, and the occasion and reasons which led him to write. Nor must we omit similar inquiry into the character, conditions, and history of those for whom the book was written, and of those also of whom the book makes mention." Having briefly touched upon the external evidence, and pointed out its weakness as favoring the later date, he sums up the internal evidence in the following "six propositions:"

1. No critic of any note has ever claimed that the later date is required by any internal evidence. 2. On the contrary, if John the apostle is the author, the comparatively rough Hebraic style of the language unquestionably argues for it an earlier date than his gospel or epistles. 3. The address "to the seven Churches which are in Asia" (i, 4, 11) implies that at this time there were only seven Churches in that Asia where Paul was once forbidden by the Spirit to speak the word. 4. The prominence in which persecution from the Jews is set forth in the epistles to the seven Churches also argues an early date. 5. A most weighty argument for the early date appears in the mention of the temple, court, and city in chapter xi, 1, 3. These references, and the further designation, in verse 8, of that city "which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also their Lord was crucified," obviously imply that the Jewish temple, court, and city were yet standing. 6. Finally, what should especially impress every reader is the emphatic statement, placed in the very title of the book, and repeated in one form and another again and again, that this is a revelation of "things which must shortly come to pass," and the time of which is near "at hand," (Rev. i, 1, 3; xxii, 6, 7, 10, 12, 20.)

In treating of the exposition of parables we are reminded that the parable has three parts: 1. The occasion and scope; 2. The similitude, in the form of a real narrative; and, 3. The moral and religious lessons. Answering to these we are told:

The hermeneutical principles which should guide us in understanding all parables are mainly three. First, we should determine the historical occasion and aim of the parable; secondly,

we should make an accurate analysis of the subject-matter, and observe the nature and properties of the thing employed as imagery in the similitudes; and thirdly, we should interpret the several parts with reference to the general scope and design of the whole, so as to preserve a harmony of proportion, maintain the unity of all the parts, and make prominent the great central truth.

Carrying out the practical character of the book, this method of interpretation is illustrated by a careful exposition of several of the parables. This "praxis" will well repay a careful study. The chapters on Interpretation of Symbols, Symbolico-Typical Actions, Symbolical Numbers, Names, and Colors, Dreams and Prophetic Ecstasy, Prophecy and its Interpretation, Daniel's Vision of the Four Empires, Old Testament Apocalyptics, The Gospel Apocalypse, The Pauline Eschatology, The Apocalypse of John, are well written, and touch on some of the most interesting points in the creed of the Christian Church. Many readers will be disposed to question the claim that some of the matters treated of in these chapters really have to a minute discussion in a work on Hermeneutics. Let opinions vary on this point as they may, all will agree that Dr. Terry writes on them with a clearness which renders it difficult for any attentive scholar to misapprehend his meaning, and with a manly confidence which bespeaks the conviction that careful examination entitles him to speak on these vexed questions with the authority of a master in Israel. Notwithstanding the comprehensive summary of New Testament Apocalyptics and Eschatology with which the twenty-sixth chapter closes, some readers will feel anxious to know what views Dr. Terry holds as to the words of the Creed, "from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead," and on what Scripture passages he would base the final coming of Christ, the future judgment, and eternal destiny. The closing sentence of the summary, "the final manifestation of the Christ, when he shall have completed the work of redemption, and delivered over the kingdom to the Father, is left by the sacred writers in too great mystery for us to affirm definitely any thing concerning it," may indicate a very safe and prudent reserve, but certainly cannot be received as a very valuable addition to our knowledge on these important topics, after so protracted an examination of many of the passages in the Bible treating on

them. In the chapter entitled "No Double Sense in Prophecy," the author shows that the Scriptures are capable of manifold practical applications, and adds that "the moment we admit the principle that portions of Scripture contain an occult or double sense we introduce an element of uncertainty in the sacred volume, and unsettle all scientific interpretation." The teachings of this chapter are worthy of special attention, and if prudently applied will save from many mistakes in the exposition of the prophetic Scriptures. The chapter on "The False and the True Accommodation," and that portion of chapter thirty-three which treats of the "Analogy of Faith," are clearly connected with the subject of the book; but however highly we may estimate the material of some other chapters of this second part, we cannot but feel that they are not essential to the completeness of the treatise, and that they needlessly swell the size of the volume, which, from the extended passages wisely used as "praxis" to train the student in the practical use of the principles of the science, is almost too extensive without them.

The third part contains a History of Biblical Interpretation. Without this the work would not have been complete. A little economy of space in the former parts, and a somewhat fuller and more systematic treatment of the History of Hermeneutics would, in our opinion, have been desirable. Nine distinct periods are dwelt upon, a chapter being devoted to each period. These chapters are full of interesting and valuable information. They do not, however, furnish a satisfactory *history* of Biblical Interpretation. They rather furnish an annotated list of many of the principal contributors to biblical literature in every age, with the insertion of the names of some who, by their attacks on Christianity, induced the friends of truth to devote their time and energies to the preparation of defensive treatises in many departments of theological literature, not confining themselves to Hermeneutics. One cannot help asking why some names find a place on the list, or wishing that a little more had been said about others. Laying down the book after a careful reading of this part, a feeling bordering on disappointment takes possession of the reader. He does not feel as if had received any clear impression of the progressive development of the science. He does not apprehend what were the particular contributions of each period to hermeneutics,

and is unable to trace their influence in bringing the science to its present advanced condition. This impression might perchance have been lessened if this part had been read before the discussion of the principles of the science. The details presented in the history, as it is, clearly and forcefully sustain what the author has said on the necessity and value of sound principles of interpretation. When giants in intellect and prodigies in learning, such as many of those named, were led by the adoption of absurd principles of interpretation soberly to advance such views as they held as a worthy exposition of the Book of God, and to support those views with earnestness, there need be—we had almost said there can be—no more convincing proof of the absolute necessity of "well-defined and self-consistent principles of Scripture interpretation." As we reflect on the exhibition of the lamentable effects of the application of incorrect or faulty principles of interpretation manifest in the expository works of such men, a sadness comes over us, and the thought cannot be repressed, What might not they have accomplished if, before entering on their work, they had thoroughly mastered the science of Biblical Hermeneutics? How wholesome would have been the effect of their labors on the theology of the ages! How blessed their influence on the Church!

The Bibliography of Hermeneutics which follows the History contains the names of many illustrious men who have been contributors to this science. Their books have done much to promote the intelligent study of the Scriptures, and to create and develop the science of Biblical Interpretation. No similar list in the future can be complete without the name of Dr. Terry, and in that list his name can hold no inferior place.

ART. X.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Reviews.

AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1884. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Beginnings of Geography; by Prof. Charles G. Haberman, LL.D. 2. The Nature of the Human Soul; by Rev. J. Ming. 3. The Duty of Catholics in the Face of Modern Unbelief; by Rev. R. F. Clarke, S. J. 4. *Quid est Homo?* A Query on the Plurality of Worlds; by Rev. Thomas Hughes, S. J. 5. The Progress of the (Roman Catholic) Church in the United States; by John Gilmary Shea. 6. The Life and Times of Frederick the Second—The Kingdom of Italy; by Prof. St. George Mivart, F.R.S., etc. 7. The Irish Question, Present and Prospective; by Thomas Power O'Connor, M.P. 8. Martin Luther, and his American Worshipers; by Rt. Rev. Mgr. Corcoran, D.D. 9. Book Notices.

A. M. E. (African Methodist Episcopal) CHURCH REVIEW, (Quarterly,) Vol. 1, No. 1, July, 1884. (Philadelphia.)—1. Thoughts about the Past, the Present, and the Future of the African M. E. Church; by Right Rev. Daniel A. Payne, D.D. 2. A Scriptural View; or, the Statement Concerning Paradise that was Lost, Regained; by Right Rev. Jabez P. Campbell, D.D. 3 An Inside View of the Great Methodist Ecumenical Conference of 1881; by Right Rev. Wm. F. Dickinson, D.D 4. The Register of the United States Treasury; by Hon. E. K. Bruce. 5. Lincoln; by Right Rev. T. M. D. Ward, D.D. 6. The Greek of the New Testament; by W. S. Scarborough, LL.D. 7. The Dying Bondman; by Mrs. F. E. W. Harper. 8. Correspondence: Letter from Bishop H. M. Turner, D.D. 9. The Republic of Hayti, and the Revolution of 1876; by Rev. J. H. Durant. 10. The Negro in Science, Art, and Literature; by D. Augustus Straker, LL.B. 11. The Ministry we Need; by the Rev. Wm. H. Thomas. 12. Ripeness in the Gospel Ministry; by Rev. T. G. Steward, D.D. 13. That Text; by the Editor, (Rev. B. T. Tanner, D.D.) 14. Editorial Notes. 15. Our Book Table. 16. The Higher Periodicals.

BAPTIST MISSIONARY MAGAZINE, July 1884. Seventieth Anniversary of the American Baptist Missionary Union. Seventieth Annual Meeting of the Board of Managers. Seventieth Annual Report. Recapitulation. General Statistical Table. Report of the Treasurer. Officers of the American Baptist Missionary Union. Preachers at Financial and Annual Meetings. Honorary Members for Life.

CHRISTIAN THOUGHT, July and August, 1884. (Rev. Charles F. Deems, Editor. Bimonthly.) 1. Counter Currents in the Thought and Speculation of the Time; by Rev. J. H. Rylance. 2. Some Recent Criticisms on Theistic Belief; by Francis L. Patton, D.D. 3. Atheistic Scientists. (a poem;) by John Stuart Blackie. 4. An Unbeliever's Description of Christianity; by the late Lord O'Neill. 5. My Science. (a poem:) by William C. Richards. 6. Vedantism: a Popular Statement of Hindu Pantheism; by Rev. T. J. Scott, (of Bareilly, India.) 7. The Humorist Playing at Philosophy. 8. Memorabilia. 9. The Summer School at Key East; by C. M. Davis. 10. About Books.

CHRISTIAN WORLD, July, 1884. The American Church, Paris, (Illustrated;) by Rev. L. T. Chamberlain, D.D. Revolution of Massachusetts General Association. Special Amusements. Echoes from Paris; by Rev. A. F. Beard, D.D. Eden, (a poem;) by M. Saillins. A Million Francs for a Million Souls; by Pastor Frossard. Work among Italians in Marseilles; by Signor Piovallini. Testimonies Respecting France. Theological Seminary at Geneva; by Professor Bardi. Protestantism and French Politics. Monthly Receipts.

JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY, July, 1884 (New York.)—1. Visual Memory; by Professor Henry F. Osborn, Sc.D. 2. Claims of the Apostles as to

Inspiration; by Rev. C. S. Thwing. 3. God's Method in the Bible; by D. W. Faunce, D.D. 4. The Fruit of the Spirit; by Rev. W. H. Cobb, D.D. 5. The Physiological Features of the Crucifixion; by Thomas A. Hoyt, D.D. 6. Miracles *versus* the Continuity of Nature; by Rev. Francis W. Ryder. 7. Is the Bible Free from Historic and Scientific Errors; by Rev. Addison P. Foster. 8. Is Evangelical Christianity Obsolete; by Rev. Charles Lowell Cooper. 9. The Cause and Tendencies of Popular Skepticism; by Rev. William Smith, (Hudson, N. Y.) 10. The Old Testament Tested; by Rev. W. F. Crafts. 11. A Naturalist in Egypt; by Principal John W. Dawson, LL.D.

NEW ENGLANDER, (Bimonthly,) September, 1884. (New Haven.)—1. Jonathan Edwards and the Half-way Covenant: by Rev. George Leon Walker, D.D., (Hartford.) 2. Jonathan Edwards as a Man, and the Ministers of the Last Century; by Rev. I. N. Tarbox, D.D., (Boston.) 3. Conditions of Success in Spelling Reform; by Prof. H. N. Day, (New Haven.) 4. Qualities of Matter, as Related to Perception; by Rev. E. Jones, (Oakland, Cal.) 5. The First Church of Hartford, Conn.; by Rev. I. N. Tarbox, (Boston.) 6. The Anti-Christian Use of the Bible in the Sunday-School; by Rev. J. M. Whiton, (Newark, N. J.) 8. The Condition of the Laboring Classes of England; by Rev. C. S. Walker, (South Amherst.) 8. Immortality and Evolution; by Miss Vida D. Scudder, (Magnolia, Mass.) 9. Underground Russia; by Marion Wilcox. (New Haven.) 10. Taxation in the United States. 11. Notices of New Books.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, August, 1884. (New York.)—1 The Encroachment of Capital; by Justice James V. Campbell. 2. The Origin of Comets: by Richard A. Proctor. 3. Are We a Nation of Rascals? by John F. Hume. 4. Man and Brute; by George J. Romanes. 5. The Drift toward Centralization; by Judge Edward G. Loring. 6. The American Element in Fiction: by Julian Hawthorne. 7. Prohibition and Persuasion; by Neal Dow and Dr. Dio Lewis.

September, 1884.—1. The Basis of Popular Government; by Bishop J. L. Spaulding. 2. The Demand of the Industrial Spirit; by Charles Dudley Warner. 3. Inspiration and Infallibility; by Rev. Dr. J. H. Rylance. 4. The Need of Liberal Divorce Laws; by Elizabeth Cady Stanton. 5. Our Remote Ancestry; by Prof. Alexander Winchell. 6. The Exclusion of the Chinese; by John H. Durst. 7. Evils of the Tariff System; by David Wells, and others.

PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, July, 1884. (New York.)—1. Rev. Dr. James Richards and his Theology, (II;) by Prof. R B. Welch, D.D. 2. The Proper Training of Young Converts; by Rev. Francis F. Hamlin. 3. Melanchthon; by Rev. Prof. Schaff. 4. The Religious Belief of Shakespeare. 5. Notes and Notices. 6. Reviews of Recent Theological Literature.

QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH, July, 1884. J. W. HINTON, Editor. (Macon, Ga.)—1. Animal and Vegetable Kingdom. 2. The Revival of Letters. 3. Greek Mythology and Philosophy. 4. Experimental Argument, etc. 5. Mormonism. 6. Theological Methods. 7. Mrs. Browning. 8. Incarnation of Christ. 9. The Category of Being. 10. Æsthetics. 11. Limits of the Beautiful. 12. Paradox. Library, Table, Views and Reviews. Editorial Notes.

UNITARIAN REVIEW AND RELIGIOUS MAGAZINE, July, 1884. (Boston.)—1. Where are We in Religion? by Rev. Thomas R. Slicer. 2. The New English Dictionary; by W. C. Ernst. 3. Idealism in German Ethics; by Rev. J. G. Brooks. 4. A Daring Faith; by Rev. John W. Chadwick. 5. Relation of the Church of To-day to Education; by Rev. John H. Allen. 6. Editor's Note-Book. 7. Current Movements and Events. 8. Things at Home and Abroad. 9. Review of Current Literature.

August, 1884.—1. Ezra Abbott, D.D., LL.D.; by Prof. James H. Thayer. 2. The Prolegomena to Tischendorf's New Testament; by Rev. A. P. Peabody, D.D. 3. Personality in Theism; by Rev. B. R. Bulkely. 4. Education of Women in France; by D. Charraud. 5. Editor's Note-Book. 6. Current Movements and Events. 7. Things at Home and Abroad; by Mrs. Martha P. Lowe. 8. Review of Current Literature.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, July, 1884. (Oberlin, Ohio.) — 1. Christian Doctrine and Life: by Rev. D. W. Simon, D.D. 2. The Study of the Hebrew Language among Jews and Christians; by the Rev B. Pick. 3. Commonplace Books: a Lecture; by Prof. James Davis Butler, LL.D. 4. Inspiration: with Remarks on the Theory Presented in Ladd's Doctrine of Sacred Scripture; by Rev. Geo. N. Boardman, D.D. 5. The Dialectic Method of Jesus; by Rev. Richard Montague. 6. The True Principles of Theological Progress; by President Fairchild. 7. Critical Notes. 8. Current Periodical Literature — American, English, French, German. 9. Notices of Recent Publications.

Article 4, filling nearly fifty pages, is an elaborate discussion of the doctrine of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures as held and taught especially among Protestants, with special references to the system or theory set forth in his recently published work by Professor Ladd, of Yale College. The writer's views are apparently much less "advanced" than are those of the author whom he reviews, though he is still himself very far removed from the literalistic and mechanical theory which so long, and, until comparatively recently, was generally accepted by the evangelical Churches. He begins by setting forth that theory as one of the two prevalent, perhaps possible, views of inspiration, the other being that form of inspiration which operates exclusively through the mind of the subject by which he speaks and writes in his own proper and consciously self-directed individuality. According to the former of these, the Bible is, in all its details, simply a transcript of the divine mind—God's thoughts expressed in human language—itself dictated by the controlling Spirit. This theory the reviewer quite correctly sets aside as altogether untenable, and no longer sustained by any respectable authority; and yet he appears not to be prepared to accept the alternative one, unless carefully guarded, and, indeed, limited, by such conditions as would change its identity. This latter is the theory of Professor Ladd, as wrought out in his elaborate treatise on "The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture."

This method of viewing Scripture doctrines, in and through certain definite theories, is beset with very considerable disadvantages, which may also become perilous by compelling the acceptance of dangerous errors because of their association with indispensable truths. It may be also objected that neither of these theories, nor any other, is either directly, or by implication, taught in the Scriptures, which, however, do most certainly claim to have been given by divine inspiration Any possible conception of such a gift implies a communication

between the divine and the human intelligence, but the method of the assumed intercourse need not to be always the same. The supernatural is a universal presence in the realm of the natural, and is able at any time to become manifest in men's natural consciousness; and, by virtue of this, "God, at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past by the prophets," and some of the forms in which he so spake will be found to belong to both of the categories included in the above theories. The *mode* in which God in any case reveals himself and his dispensations is incomparably less important than is the fact that he does it.

The word "inspiration" is here, as in many other cases, so used as to lead to a wrong conception of the thing indicated. It seems to be thought of as a force like gravity or magnetism, which may vary in its intensity, and be present in greater or less degrees in different instances; and accordingly some parts of Scripture are absurdly spoken of as being more inspired than others. Inspiration, in respect to its efficiency, is the divine mind communicating thoughts and purposes to the human consciousness, and hence, as to its source, it is unchangeably infinite, but it is conditioned, in its manifestations, "according to the will of God." In some cases, as in the words of Christ, and in not a few utterances of the prophets and apostles, the divine lesson comes to us directly and unmixed, while in others it is mingled with human admixtures, and is presented in a human setting, yet so manifested that the quickened spiritual instincts readily apprehend and appropriate its teachings; and the written word is the record of the divine manifestations of the dispensations of Heaven to mankind, whether in revelations made to persons, or as indicated in the affairs of peoples and communities. The reviewer with sufficient clearness indicates Professor Ladd's defective notions, but though presumably dissenting, yet his dissent is either left to be inferred, or at most is only hinted, and the views presented are almost never directly antagonized; as if the statement of an incorrect opinion were its sufficient refutation, or else that to oppose the truth to a pernicious error were a breach of courtesy. Professor Ladd states and elaborates the thought that while all spiritual truth comes from God to man, that which is recorded in the Bible differs in no important sense from that which is given to all the

faithful at all times, so dispensing with the sole authority of the written word, and, indeed, rendering it, though still useful, yet not essential to the knowledge of God and his salvation; and his statements are here reproduced without being directly controverted. Again, the distinction between *inspiration* and *revelation* is emphasized, shutting up the sense of the former to the subjective state of the soul, by which it is made capable of receiving the truth, while by the latter term is indicated the objective truth given by God to man. The distinction may be both real and valuable; but in its ordinary and almost universal use, the former term covers both these ideas. The idea of the inspiration of the Bible as generally entertained by the learned, as well as the unlearned, includes both the divine activity in revealing, and the supernatural apprehension by the human consciousness of truths and doctrines which men could not otherwise attain to. Both the things revealed and the modes of their revelation are unique; they are given in their own peculiar way, and for that reason they are especially profitable to men.

CHRISTIAN (CAMPBELLITE) QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1884. (Columbia, Mo.)—1. Genuineness of the Second Epistle of Peter; by Prof. J. W. M'Garvey. 2. Hermeneutical Criticism; by B. U. Watkins. 3. The Gift of the Holy Spirit, (Acts ii, 38, 39;) by Hon. James Beatty. 4. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans: A Paraphrase, with Notes; by Pres. B. R. Dungan. 5. The Church in its Idea and its Form; by Pres. W. K. Pendleton. 6. The New Congregational Creed; by J. Z. Tyler. 7. What is the Church of Christ? and What are its Numbers? by Pres. F. M. Bruner. 8. The Temptation of Jesus; by J. W. Monsor. 9. The Divine Mystery; by Henry Schell Lobingen. 10. Book Notices.

Article 8 of the above, though brief, is a spirited paper, and as wholesome as it is vivacious; and, with other papers in this "Review," it clearly indicates a most gratifying tendency in the body that it represents to a wholesome orthodoxy in respect to some of the most important articles of the Christian faith. The following respecting the contact between Christ and "the Tempter" is certainly a happy putting of the case:

Baffled humanity, writhing under the captivity of Satan, is now to renew its courage and inspirations by following One who, ever having done the will of his heavenly Father, comes not to this tremendous but necessary contest pliant and weak, but capable of coping with principalities and powers in high places. Such strength does one derive from constant obedience to the divine will. Nor must we be afraid to face this fact of God—the putting Satan to work on the character and life of Jesus. Augustine

often used to say, that the entire history, moral and spiritual, of the world, revolves around two persons, Adam and Christ. Certainly, as to temptation, its origin, onset, victory, defeat, destruction, and the like, much devolves on them. The invasion of Adam is the prophesy of the invasion of Jesus. The maintenance of position, given of God, in which Adam proved such a failure was verily nipping the hopes of mankind in the bud; the interposition of Jesus, and the issue he joins with the Adversary, is as a new lease of those hopes, or, more correctly, the implanting of a new and better hope. It was no extraordinary thing for Satan to attack the Son of Man; nor was it extraordinary for the Spirit to lead Jesus into the wilderness for this purpose. "Hast thou considered my servant Job?" asked God of Satan hundreds of years previous to this. A careful study of the Scriptures will satisfy any one of the place filled by Satan in the drama of mankind. There is a dark and mysterious element in man's life and history, a casting down and an elevation, a moral ebb and flow, which nothing else can explain save this constant wrestle with Satan. . . . Whether God sent Satan into this world, originally, on a mission to man, is not a question that necessarily forces itself on one by positions already taken in this article; since it is the purpose of God to wrest evil into the service of good. Satan was evidently in the world, and for the purpose of mischief. God utilizes him in the interest of man. Under the divine guidance, he is made a factor in the formation of moral character.

To this it may be pertinent to add another quotation, from another source, which may also cast light upon this great mystery of Christ's temptation and victory in the wilderness:

If we consider the three specific temptations of Christ, it will readily appear that they all related directly to his Messianic character and mission. This, probably, was the fact in respect to all his temptations during his forty days' sojourn in the wilderness. He had gone through all the temptations of private life during his abode in Galilee, and had preserved his integrity in them all; but his new conditions, and the tremendous truth of his high calling to rescue a ruined world and to fulfill all the work appointed to the Messiah, raised new thoughts and called for new purposes and modes of action for the accomplishment of that work. These brought with them their momentary doubtings and perplexities; perhaps, also, hesitations as to methods, though certainly not as to the simplicity and steadiness of his purpose to "fulfill all righteousness"—to do only the will of the Father. In the three specified temptations their Messianic relations are clearly obvious, and their real nature can be properly appreciated only as they are so considered. They were, (1) to use his divinity for personal ends; (2) to demonstrate his Messiahship by "signs;" (3) to conciliate the enemy in bringing in the kingdom of God.

AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN AND ORIENTAL JOURNAL, July, 1884. (Chicago.) — 1. Lectures on Polytheism, (III;) by F. G. Fleay. 2. Schliemann at Ilium; by A. C. Merriam. 3. The Myths of the Raccoon and the Crawfish, among the Dakota Tribes; by J. H. Dorsey. 4. Antiquities of Mexico, (II;) by L. P. Gratacap. 5. Life among the Mandans; by Edward D. Neill. 6. Emblematical Mounds, Bird Effigies; by Stephen D. Peet. 7. Among the Mounds. (Editorial.) Notes on Classic Archæology. Notes from Oriental Periodicals. Notes on American Archæology, (Mound Builders, etc.) Book Reviews.

The most interesting feature of this number is what is given respecting the mounds found in the Ohio Valley and along the Upper Mississippi. These have been known from the earliest occupation of these parts by white men, but they have been strangely neglected by antiquarians and all classes of men of science. Indeed, until comparatively recently their antiquarian value had not been generally recognized, and so able a writer as Mr. George Bancroft writing of these land-marks, speaks of them as probably caused by running water. It is now well ascertained, however, that they were constructed for purpose of sepulture, and many of them have been opened and found to contain human bones, pottery, and charred wood. But most who have engaged in this work of excavation have known nothing of the historical and ethnological value of these things, and so the mounds have been destroyed, and their contents carried away as curiosities, and lost or broken up. It is well that attention has at length been called to the subject, and it may be hoped that enough may be rescued from destruction to serve as a helpful guide in the exploration of the obscure but interesting science of the older American archæology, and also to give some intelligent conjectures respecting the races that inhabited these regions before the advent of the red men. That they were not of our Indian race is quite certain, for the traditions of these tell nothing about the Mound Builders, whose civilization was both higher and generically diverse from their more barbarous successors.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, August, September, 1884. (Cincinnati.) 1. The Epistle to the Hebrews and the First Epistle of John; by Professor W. N. Clarke. 2. Ignatius Loyola; by Rev. J. R. Henderson. 3. Primitive Man; by Prof. E. L. Hicks. 4. The Christian Church Archetype; by Rev. E. J. Fisk. 5. Baptists and Liberty of Conscience; by Henry C. Vedder. 6. The Sources of "The Teaching of the Apostles;" by Prof. J. C. Long. 7. Book Reviews and Notices.

The sixth of the articles in the Baptist Quarterly, on "The Teaching," is a notable illustration of the influence of pre-

possession to modify evidence. Because it seems to show that in the ancient Church the distinction of the orders of bishops, priests, and deacons in the Christian ministry was not only not accepted as of divine authority, but it was probably quite unknown, therefore High-Church Episcopalians must discredit it as either a forgery or the production of an heretical sect. And because it points out an acceptable form of bapism, otherwise than by immersion, therefore the Baptists are in duty bound to show that its authority is very small. It is well known that considerable parts of "The Teaching" are also found in other patristic documents, and therefore it is assumed that the former was drawn from the latter, and of course of later date, and so possessed of comparatively little authority. But it may be urged, on the contrary, that very clearly the more brief and simple document, which indicates a less fully developed liturgical tendency, is the original and more trustworthy paper. Expert testimony is at best of not the highest value; and when it is known that the affiant comes to his duty with strong predilections toward one side rather than the other, his opinion becomes comparatively worthless. In this case, therefore, both prelatists and immersionists must be asked to stand aside as disqualified for judging on the points at issue.

CATHOLIC WORLD, (Monthly,) July, 1884. (New York.)—1. Mexico of To-day: by Bryan J. Clinche. 2. Is the American Republic an Anomaly in History? by Thomas Felton. 3. A Tragi-Comedy; by Maurice F. Eagan. 4. The Last Night of a Martyr: by M. A. Allies. 5. Phillis Wheatley, the Negro Poetess: by Rev. John Slatterly. 6. The Agotac of the Pyrenean Provinces: by F. Raymond-Barker. 7. A Lesson of Life; by A. Repplier. 8. The Irish Words of Shakespeare; by C. M. O'Keefe. 9. Katharine, chaps. v, vi; by E. G. Martin. 10. The Religion of Ancient Egypt; by Rev. J. Nilan.

August.—1. Solitary Island, chaps. i–iv; by Rev. J. Talbot Smith. 2. Phases of Faith and Unfaith. 3. Ta-wan-dah, the Last of the Pecos; by Very Rev. J. H. Defouri. 4. Two Miraculous Conversions from Judaism; by Rev. A. F. Hewitt. 5. Concerning Sir Walter Raleigh; by Margaret F. Sullivan. 6. Cattle Ranch Life in Colorado; by W. T. Larned. 7. Ruskin, as a Teacher; by Agnes Repplier. 8. Katharine, chaps. vii-ix; by E. G. Martin. 9. The Cost of Monarchy and Aristocracy in Great Britain; by W. F. Dennehy. 10. Who Could have Taken it? 11. New Publications.

September, 1884.—1. Contemporaneous China; by Alfred M. Cotte. 2. My Staff of Age, (from the Celtic:) by Alfred M. Williams. 3. Philistia; by Maurice F. Egan. 4. Unitarian Belief; by H. L. Richards. 5. Solitary Island, chaps. v–viii; by Rev J. Talbot Smith. 6. With the Carlists; by John Augustus O'Shea. 7. The Oratory in London; by Mrs. Charles Kent. 8. Katharine, chaps. x–xii; by E. G. Martin. 9. The Liquification of the Blood of St. Januarius; by L. B. Binnse. 10. New Publications.

The article on the "Blood of St. Januarius" is characteristic, and proves what we have said in another place, that the Church

of Rome abates nothing of its highest and most absurd pretensions of a thousand years ago. Probably there is no more patent falsehood in all the list of "lying wonders" by which the Romish Church beguiles its unreasoning dupes than this St. Januarius affair; but still it will not do for an "infallible" Church to confess its own past impositions, nor will it forego its gains, and therefore the falsehood must be perpetuated and reiterated. The victims of these practices may be entitled to our pity; but quite another sentiment must be entertained toward those who love and make a lie.

English Reviews.

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1884. (London.)—1. Mr. Browning. 2. Italian University Life in the Middle Ages. 3. Privileges and Aristocracy. 4. John Wycliffe, Precursor of the Reformation. 5. The Speculative Philosophy of Religion. 6. Natural Law in the Spiritual World. 7. English Policy in the Soudan and Egypt. 8. Political Survey of the Quarter. 9. Contemporary Literature.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, (American Edition,) July, 1884. (New York)—1. Municipal London. 2. Modern Spanish Literature. 3. The Romance and Reality of American Railroads. 4. Peter the Great. 5. England and her Second Colonial Empire. 6. The Three Poems. "In Memoriam." 7. Greek Archæology: Mr. Furgeson's Parthenon, and Temple of Diana. 8. The West Indies and the Sugar Bounties. 9. Redistribution and Representative Democracy. 10. Mr. Gladstone's Foreign Policy.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, OR CRITICAL JOURNAL, (American Edition.) July, 1884. (New York,)—1. Memoirs of M. de Vitrolles. 2. Lightning Conductors. 3. The Chiefs of Grant. 4. The Divorce of Catharine of Aragon. 5. Life of Montstuart Elphinstone. 6. The Future of Congo. 7. Life and Opinions of Frederic Maurice. 8. John Sebastian Bach. 11. Heffter's International Law.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, July, 1884. (London.)—1. The Old Testament and Human Sacrifices; by Rev. C. H. H. Wright, D.D., Belfast. 2. The Life and Works of Torquato Tasso; by Rev. Hugh Maxmillan, D.D., LL.D., Greenock. 3. The Rev. Adolph Sydow and the Scottish Church Question: A Resuscitation; by Principal Cairns, Edinburgh. 4. Protestant Missions: Their Ideal and its Realization; by John Robson, D.D., Aberdeen. 5. The Consensus of the Reformed Confessions; by Rev. A. A. Hodge, LL.D., Princeton, N. J. 6. Professor Robertson Smith's Lectures on the Prophets of Israel; by Rev. I. E. Dwinell, D.D., Oakland, Cal. 7. Wiclif and Huss; by Principal Brow, Aberdeen. 8. Samuel Rutherford; by Professor Graham, D.D., London. 9. Current Literature.

The fifth of the last list of articles, by Rev. A. A. Hodge, of Princeton, is a reprint from the (American) Presbyterian Review of April last, and was written and published, it may be presumed, with the expectation that it would somewhat influence the action of the then approaching Pan-Presbyterian Council, that met in Belfast last August. The first meeting

of that Council, in 1876, brought into notice the two facts, before very well known, (1) that most of the Presbyterian Churches and denominations, both those in Europe and in America, are at one in most of the essential doctrines of Christianity, and yet that within this general unity there is, nevertheless, very considerable differences in the modes of defining their common doctrinal opinions; and (2) that in the popular teaching of nearly all Presbyterian Churches their distinctive doctrines are seldom or never heard, and that many of both the ministry and the laity of these Churches feel that their traditional creeds are not in harmony with their religious thinking. The recognition of these things led to the attempt to have their objectionable features removed, by providing a "*Consensus* of Doctrines," which would express the real convictions of the Presbyterians of the present age, and to which all classes and sections of that order of Christians might freely and heartily consent. A committee was accordingly appointed to prepare such a basis of agreement, for the consideration of the next quadrennial Council, but, as might have been expected, the only practical result was the discovery that the work given them could not be done. All felt the infelicities of the case, but nobody could find out a remedy.

Presbyterianism, though originally only a form of ecclesiastical polity, has become by usage synonymous with Calvinism, and accordingly, among the requisites for admission to the Council was the profession of the Calvinistic faith; and it was conceded that the various symbols of doctrines of the so-called "Reformed" Churches of the continent of Europe, together with the Westminster Confession, may be accepted as embodiments of that system of doctrine. It might have seemed, therefore, that with such a substantial unity in their original doctrinal standards a common basis might have been readily agreed upon, but the difficulty was found to be of another kind. The convictions of the great body of the Presbyterians, throughout the world, are no longer in harmony with the doctrines that were firmly held by their theological ancestors, and which are set forth with unmistakable clearness in their creeds and confessions. The distinctive doctrines of the Presbyterian Churches, as defined in their official formularies of faith, and as they were clearly announced in public and private down to the

time of the grandparents of the present generation, are no longer heard from their pulpits, and their ministers have either departed from the faith of their fathers, or else they have consented to hide in silence what they believe to be the truth of God. These facts place those Churches in a most undesirable dilemma; either they must revise their creeds, which nobody accepts in their obvious grammatical sense, so as to conform to the beliefs of those who use them, which it is conceded is impossible—and so the public teachings of the Churches must be something quite another than that which their official creeds confessedly set forth, which would involve an immorality, or else they must torture the plain and unmistakable language of the confessions that it shall convey meanings which the authors of those venerated forms knew only to reject and execrate, which is scarcely less objectionable. The former of these methods is that adopted by the great body of Presbyterian ministers, and one no longer expects to hear the distinctive doctrines of Calvinism from any Presbyterian pulpit. The other alternative, which Dr. Hodge seems to approve, is to force a construction upon the words used, in open contradiction to both their grammatical and their historical meaning. This has been formally done by the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, so that while the Confession, to the unsophisticated reader, teaches high Calvinism, the grave divines assure us that it really means just what Arminians have always been teaching.

We are bound whenever possible to give to every man credit for sincerity, which we do in this case, otherwise we might suspect a lack of candor in those who claim that the whole category of evangelical doctrines, commonly designated "the doctrines of grace," belong as a special possession to Calvinism. The doctrine of original sin, with its entailment of universal condemnation, and of entire hopelessness except through the *prevenient* grace of the Spirit, belongs to Wesleyan Arminianism as really as to Calvinism, and therefore these doctrines and all that they imply must be excluded from the *differentia* which contradistinguish the two systems. In a properly guarded sense non-Calvinists may subscribe to the doctrine of "election" and "predestination," but not as *unconditional decrees*. The divine sovereignty is as precious a truth to

others as to Calvinists; but with those that sovereignty involves nothing of the character of a remorseless despotism. Properly understood, Arminians will not hesitate to say that only through "regenerating" grace actually received can any man repent and turn to God; but they will also say that this "preventing grace" by which the sinner turns to God is itself an incipient regeneration, and that this is given to every man "to profit withal." The real difference between the two systems is that one asserts that grace is both unconditional in its workings and irresistible in its progress; that God alone is active in man's salvation, which is perfected without human co-operation, except as such action is irresistibly compelled.

Both Calvinists and Arminians hold and teach the doctrine of the freedom of the will; but while the former hold to only a *modal* freedom, moving only as impelled *ab extra*, the latter believes in a real self-determination, which may be *persuaded*, but cannot be *compelled*.

It may be granted that philosophically and logically Calvinism may be a simpler and even a more rationalistic system than its opposite; but the ultimate outcome of its logic is too horrible to be contemplated. It certainly is no part of the theology of the heart, and it is well that it is no longer heard in the pulpits of evangelical Christendom.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, (WESLEYAN,) July, 1884. 1. Free Education. 2. A French Critic on Democracy. 3. The Sunday-school System of Methodism. 4. Lord Lyndhurst. 5. Aid to Preaching. 6. Holiness and Righteousness. 7. Frederic Denison Maurice. 8. General Gordon. 9. Short Reviews and Brief Notices. Summaries of Foreign Periodicals.

THE first article in the above, manifestly the production of a pen pretty well known by American Methodist readers, for his speech "bewrays" him, is a strangely sophistical, one-sided, and incorrect tirade against "free education," as established in this country, and in the more liberally governed States of Europe. It is fallacious, because it assumes that all public provisions for private convenience or advantage is an injustice to the taxpayer and a degradation to the receiver—a principle which, if applied at all points, would not only do away with free sittings in places of worship, and all forms of endowments for religious or benevolent purposes, except as paid for at full cost, but would also require that there shall be no free highways or bridges, but that tolls shall every-where be levied and collected, in propor-

tion to the cost of making and maintaining such "improvements." Clearly the principle so applied proves too much, and any conclusion drawn from it is wholly unreliable. The facts or assumptions of the article, where not untrue, give only one side of the cases brought into notice, and the omission or ignoring of the facts which belong to the subjects in hand render the presentation of the case wholly untruthful, and the conclusions worthless because essential factors are omitted from the problem. The statements of what are assumed to be facts, especially in respect to matters connected with the workings of the public school system of this country, are in many cases so entirely incorrect as to deprive them of any value as grounds of argument. Evidently there is an animus in the article that springs from some unrevealed cause which, at our distance, cannot be clearly understood. Possibly our school system would not be the very best for Great Britain, and if not they do well not to adopt it; but the best friends of education very generally approve it, not as faultless, but the best available for our people, and, so believing, who shall deny us the privilege of using it?

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July, 1884. (Leonard Scott Publishing Company. Philadelphia.) 1. Codification of English Law: A Prospect. 2. The Myth of Simon Magus. 3. Corea. 4. The Christian Harem. 5. The River Congo, and the Proposed Congo Treaty. 6. William IV. 7. The Woman Question in Europe. Contemporary Literature: 1. Theology. 2. Philosophy. 3. Politics, Sociology, Voyages and Travels. 4. Science. 5. History and Biography. 6. Belles-Lettres. Our Colonial Empire.

The Westminster has long stood in the foremost rank of the periodical literature of the English language, in respect to learning and literary ability, but it is always intensely, and, indeed, offensively, anti-Christian. Usually each number has its specifically infidel paper, which place in this issue is occupied by the second article, "The Myth of Simon Magus." It is of that class of writings whose absurd fallaciousness was demonstrated and rendered ridiculous by the late Archbishop Whately in his "Myth of Napoleon Bonaparte."

The article on "The Christian Harem" is a scathing exhibition of the soullessness of the popular morality respecting masculine unchastity. It might serve as a "campaign document" in the current canvass; and as such our specially pure-spoken dailies would perhaps refuse to print it.

INDIAN QUARTERLY REVIEW, July, 1884. (Calcutta.)—1. The Hindus in the Punjab; by Denzil C. Ibbetsen, (Lahore.) 2. Salt Consumption and Revenue; by Rev. S. Mateer, (Trevandrum.) 3. Christianity in Eastern Bengal; by the Editor. 4. Krishna Pariksha, or Kriskna Tested; by Rev. J. J. Lucas, (Moinpuri.) 5. A Missionary Charge to a General Assembly of Ministers and Missionaries; by Rev. H. Jessup, D.D., (Syrian Mission) 6. Notices of Books. 7. Notes and Intelligence.

LA NUOVA SCIENZA, Anno I, Fasciala II, Apriele, Maggio, Giugno, 1884. (Tode-Umbria.) 1. Il Benvenuto degli Scienziate a Noi. 2. L'Ordierno Pensiero Italiano. 3. La Formala Pitagorica della Cosmica Evoluzione. 4. L'Evoluzione Anticlericale Germanica Confrontata con l'Italiana. 5. Nota Filosofiche della Singole Scienze. Notizie Bibliografiche. Varieta.

German Reviews.

THEOLOGISCHE STUDIEN UND KRITIKEN, (Theological Essays and Reviews.) 1884. Fourth Number.—*Essays:* 1. LOOFS. The Importance of the Doctrine of Justification in the Defense of the Symbolics of the Lutheran Churches. 2. SMEND, The Significance of the Jerusalemic Temple in the Old Testament Religion. *Thoughts and Remarks:* 1. MEINKE, The Platonic and New Testament Idea of the ὁσιότης. 2. WARTH and LÖCKLE. On the ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος in the Lord's Prayer. *Reviews:* KÖLLING, History of the Arian Heresy; reviewed by MÜLLER.

KIRCHLICHE MONATSCHRIFT,(Church Monthly.) 1884. Ninth Number.—1. STÖCKER. The Church and Politics. 2. EISELEN, The Duty of our Protestant Church of the Present and the "Positive-Union Party." 3. MARTUS, The Special Task of the Home Mission in the Newly-awakened Conflict against Drunkenness. 4. KROMPHARDT, The "Proof-Bible." 5. Spring Meeting of the Friends of the "Positive-Union" in Halle in Saxony. Monthly Review.

Prof. Smend, of Basle, has a very interesting article in the *Studien und Kritiken* on "The Significance of the Jerusalemic Temple in the Old Testament Religion." With no other sacred place in the world has there been connected so much devotion, veneration, and love as the Jew cherished toward Mount Zion. For never has any religious community felt with more intensity and warmth than the Jewish, and never had any sacred spot more significance than this, for the religious life. Without it neither were the growth nor the continuance of that community conceivable which was formed in Judea after the Babylonic exile. But it is impossible to have a proper conception of this piety after the exile without closely considering its manifold relation to the temple. And furthermore, the history of the temple is far from being the history of the Old Testament religion. Nevertheless, it is useful, for the proper comprehension of this question, to inquire how the

temple gained its immense importance, and how this, at a later period, was lost. These are the points that are discussed at great length and with marked acumen in this article. The author endeavors to show in the history of the temple how its great worth for the peculiarity of the Old Testament religion came to be expressed, and how, on the other hand, the temple became a mighty vehicle of religious life.

Toward the close of the discussion the author makes the assertion that Mount Zion was the most important reality which the true faith possessed on earth. When the temple had fallen into ruins, it appeared how greatly this sacred mountain was the central point, even for the prophets, and an anchor of their hopes for the future. The ancient people and the ancient state were forever annihilated; for that period, at least, their restoration was inconceivable. Nothing but a religious community could arise from the ruins which was necessarily to be cemented by worship around Mount Zion, and, though the Jews still hoped for the worldly rule of Israel, it was impossible to expect to produce this by a development of political power; but Israel thought it had a glorious *future* before it as the only possessor of the true faith. By the conversion of all the heathen, Jerusalem was to become the most magnificent city of the entire world, in which should live a nation of nothing but kings. In the interim the temple was to be no longer the most important support of Judaism. This support was now to be transferred to the sacred writings; that is, to the law and the prophets. They had found in the written word of God a higher and better guarantee for the faith than even the temple and Mount Zion could lastingly offer them. Therefore the existence of Judaism was not called into question by the fall of the temple. But the fulfillment of the hope of a Messiah was thereby removed to a great distance, and thereby zealotry was suppressed, while Judaism lost the last remnant of its political character, and became confessedly nothing but a religious sect. The thought of the temple and Jerusalem then retained its significance only for the future; for the Jewish future can never dispense with this hope. The fall of the temple was, nevertheless, in the highest degree fatal to Judaism, for with it was connected the central thought and moving principle of the spiritual life of the Jews.

Another characteristic article for this Review is that concerning the true meaning of the Greek words, ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος, used in the Lord's Prayer for our ordinary expression of "*daily bread.*" Nearly fifty years ago an article in this same journal by a German theologian spoke of the many heroes of philological and theological learning who have written largely regarding the true conception of this word. And from that time to this it seems that discussion and controversy have not been able to settle and absolutely fix its true definition. This is the author's apology for venturing on another effort to find out the exact meaning of that one word. To do this he enters the etymological field and marshals up a number of words which may or may not have had an influence on the true significance of the one now used in the Greek text of the Lord's Prayer.

We cannot undertake to follow the author in this intricate and learned excursus, but will simply say that the trouble of German theologians seems to be the uncertainty as to whether the expression "daily bread" means simply the food of the current day or the food that we need *day by day.* The author contends that the term at present used in the Greek indicates the bread required for the day on which the prayer is uttered, and maintains also that this expression is more in harmony with the Lord's Prayer as our *daily* morning prayer than any other. And he goes on to say: "One could, indeed, pray for the *daily needed* food and that for the future, but if we pray for the bread for the present commencing day we are thereby admonished that to-morrow we must again offer the same prayer, confining that to the new day." The author has no sympathy with the explanation of some theologians, that this "daily bread" refers to spiritual food, and declares this to be a monstrous perversion of language. He insists that the petition is made absolutely for, and in regard to, bodily nourishment, and is thereby strengthened in his conception of the true meaning of the word "daily." The author also appeals to Luther's translation, which indicates simply the bread required for the current day, and cannot be understood as extending beyond that, and suggests the probability that the use of the word in question indicates that our Saviour pronounced this prayer in the early morning.

French Reviews.

REVUE CHRETIENNE, (Christian Review.) May, 1884.—1. ASTIE, The Fear of the Protestant Principle in the Ranks of French Protestantism. 2. E. W., A Psychological Critic. 3. SABATIER, M. Pasteur. 4. E. DE PRESSENSE, Review of the Month.

June, 1884. 1. FALLOT. The Piety which Protests. 2. BRIDEL, Determinism and the Religion of the Present Epoch. 3. ***, A Visit to Maennedorf. 4. PRADEZ, Tear and Dew—a Poem. 5. GUERLE, Necrology. Review of the Month.

July, 1884.—1. ST. ANDRE, The Conquest of Africa. 2. CLOTILDE REY, Some of the Pictures of the Last *Salon*. 3. STAPIER, Theological Chronicles. 4. Bibliographical Bulletin. Monthly Review by E. DE PRESSENSE.

The present numbers of the *Revue* are more than ordinarily marked for their special attention to popular and practical subjects. The hero of the hour among the French scientific experimenters is M. Pasteur, to whom Sabatier, in the May number, pays a very flattering tribute. The life of the great scientist has just been given to the world in a small volume, entitled "History of a Learned Man by an Ignorant One." The author is not named, but the attribute which he so modestly assumes indicates him to be the son-in-law, companion, and assistant of the distinguished savant. Thus the complete familiarity between the author and his subject enables the former to be a perfect mouth-piece for the latter, and to present him to the world just as he is, and acts, and thinks.

One day at the Academy of Sciences, one of Pasteur's colleagues, while hearing him explain the mode of some of his marvelous discoveries, involuntarily exclaimed: "That is a romance; it is too beautiful to be true!" Experience has since converted the skeptic, and has proved that in the line of wonders the science of to-day is more fertile than imagination; and Pasteur, after a long line of struggles and trials, has come out quite triumphant in developing a new order of existences hitherto unsuspected by the world. He commenced his peculiar line of experiments in the matter of decomposition and fermentation, and as the result of a series of simple and exact experiments he perceived in each fermentation the existence and action of vegetations, or microscopic beings, that accomplish this transformation. But these infinitely little existences are a mystery. Whence do they come? Are they formed of themselves, or do they proceed from germs? And thus Pasteur found himself face to face with the problem of spontaneous

generations. While absorbed with these studies the first chemist of France begged him to examine the disease of the silk-worms. This he did with so much success that silk growers are now able by means of the microscope to separate the diseased eggs from the healthy, and thus to cultivate only what is valuable. His next experiments were on the blood of diseased animals, and in these he ultimately found that the principle of the virus is an animalcule, which he denominates a microbe. He again finds out an antidote to this virus, and with it inoculates the infected animals. Thus by vaccine matter Pasteur becomes master of most of the diseases that are the enemy of the stock-raiser; and it is said that to-day, in France, more than 400,000 head of cattle are inoculated. For a long time surrounding European nations were incredulous as to his discoveries, but Huxley finally declared that their value to France would alone suffice to pay the five milliards of war indemnity to Germany.

Since that time Pasteur has extended his investigations to epidemic diseases of the human system, and the most incredulous have been obliged to yield to the evidence of facts. The savant is now pursuing his studies, making the yellow fever, the cholera, and hydrophobia the special subjects of his investigation. His very last triumph was a victory over the latter disease, for he is now inoculating members of the canine race with an antidote to their most terrible disease, and he seems confident of success. Sabatier, the author of this article, while treating it historically and scientifically, has, nevertheless, uppermost in his mind the very interesting fact to a Christian man that this great savant is not a materialist, and this is his very logical reason for treating at large a subject that at first sight may not seem to be at home in the pages of a religious magazine. But Pasteur was recently honored with an election to the most distinguished literary body of France, namely, the French Academy, and on the occasion of his induction to that body he made a most magnificent profession of spiritual and religious faith—virtually asking the question why genuine science should not be religious. The microscope of Pasteur has revealed to us the unknown world of the infinitely small, as the telescope and astronomical calculations have revealed to us the world of the infinitely great. And as Pasteur has pro-

ceeded from triumph to triumph with his microscope, guided by an almost inspired genius, he has seen more and more of a divine Creator whose all-pervading power reaches a depth of littleness incomprehensible to man. The Christian world in France finds with him strong support, for which it fully honors him.

The Monthly Review of the July number indicates that its author accepts with great satisfaction the recent action of the Senate on the new law of divorce, recently passed by both sections of the parliamentary body. One very offensive article in the civil code of France was that declaring that the husband might commit adultery with impunity. When the new law was first presented to the Senate for discussion, an attempt was made to have this disgraceful clause erased, but it was retained, after a bitter discussion, by quite a large majority. When the law came up for a second reading, Pressensé again offered an amendment abolishing this clause, which was strongly supported by other senators, to whom the idea that there should be a morality of one sex different from that of the other was quite revolting, although the sentiment of it seemed deeply inrooted in French manners. The partisans for the immunity of the stronger sex showed great irritation in the course of the discussion, and were strongly supported by the loose and immoral press. But the result was on the side of justice.

The semi-official synod of the "Reformed Church" of France recently held its annual convocation at Nantes. More than four hundred churches were regularly represented. A very excellent spirit, one of large piety and good accord, reigned during the entire session; a very pleasant feature of which was the fact that the "free Churches" of France, Switzerland, England, and America were also represented by delegates, who came with generous sympathies and kind words, and were warmly welcomed. This semi-official synod is called so because it is a voluntary combination of the orthodox portion of the "Reformed Church," and therefore its acts are binding only on those who choose to become members of that body. As this synod grows in importance and numbers it feels more and more the need of a complete independence from the State. But this can be gained only at the risk of losing its portion of the annual appropriations. To supplement these, eighty

thousand francs were collected last year for the cause of education and for subventions to those whom the State too meagerly pays. There was a growing disposition among the members of the body to train their churches as rapidly as possible to the point of effecting a deliverance from the State by raising their own funds and paying their own way in independence.

ART. XI.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

THE EVANGELICAL ASSOCIATION OF FRANCE.

THIS now famous association for the spread of French Protestantism held its recent annual meeting in Marseilles; and the contrast between its early beginnings and its present stature and vigor is very gratifying. In the year 1833, when there seemed to be a religious awakening and inquiry after the true faith, an anonymous letter in the "Archives du Christianisme" brought together a few believing men who founded an association whose object was declared to be the spread of the Gospel in France. And this young society found unexpected sympathy and coworkers, not only in France, but also in foreign lands, such as Switzerland, England, Ireland, and America. Branch associations soon sprang up in other French cities, and Protestants, of whose existence men had no suspicion, were discovered by the messengers of this body, and frequently entire families and groups were discovered through the pastoral work and again united to the Protestant Church, and conversions from the Catholic Church also gave testimony that the power and blessing of God were with this people.

But these joyful results were not without antagonism and trouble, which, however, became, in the hands of God, the means of a deeper experience. The French Protestants were poor, and their needs were beyond their means. A deficit occurred from year to year which has followed them down to the present day, but in their darkest hour Providence has ever been to them both silver and gold. What was more unfortunate for them was the persecution from the state authorities. The principle of religious liberty was acknowledged in theory, but in practice was withheld from this very small Protestant minority. Their meetings were forbidden or violently dissolved, their itinerant evangelists and colporteurs were punished with fine and imprisonment, and every pressure and inducement was brought to bear in order to force back their converts into the Catholic Church. These vexatious and unlawful proceedings were continued under the *régime* of the third Napoleon, under whom the friendship of the Catholic clergy was the *sine qua non* for political preferment. In spite of all this the development of the association was rapid and healthy; the first three years its income arose

from 7,000 to 48,000 francs, and the number of active workers from 11 to 51. Chapels were opened in a great variety of places. But the joyful increase of the association received a hard blow after ten years of existence. The insufficient income forced a reduction of the active agents, and for a time the enemies triumphed.

But the Lord was again with them, and in the following year the union counted again 77 colporteurs, evangelists, and pastors in its service, and a year later not less than 137. The gospel spirit seized whole families, and at times whole communities. Then came the revolution of 1848, with its anxieties and financial depression; the society was almost ruined. But in the epoch of their greatest need a sincere friend gave them about 100,000 francs, and other gifts came to them even from distant Russia. The Napoleonic period was one of vexatious and brutal outrages; not even a religious meeting was allowed without the sanction of the police, and their schools, chapels, and other places of assemblage were violently closed. This lasted for some ten years, and all without any justice, or cause, or judicial decision. Then, as did the Huguenots of old, so did they hold their divine service in retired forests. The faithful were determined to hold their ground in spite of all the disadvantages which they were called on to suffer, and they remained faithful till the end. But at last this period of hostility passed by. In the year 1863 M. V. de Pressensé, who had become old and wearied, laid down his leadership, which was taken up by the faithful and active George Fish, and held until his death in 1881. Now, after fifty years of activity, the association is in a very flourishing condition, and may God bless its future work in France!

A NEW LEAGUE IN SWITZERLAND.

For the last few years Switzerland has experienced a great deal of trouble with her churches and her schools. About a year and a half ago the Salvation Army opened there its campaign, which has contributed not a little to this agitation and irritation. The antagonism in Switzerland between the National Church and the Free Church, as well as the various sectarian organizations, render it a soil where such an innovation might count on success, and in the beginning these Salvationists met with more countenance than was acceptable to the earnest Christians of the land. But as soon as they began their noisy public demonstrations, they were violently opposed by all who were indifferent or hostile to Christianity, and the result was violence on the public street and attacks on the houses wherein the Salvation meetings were being held; and this spirit of violence finally so excited the unruly that even innocent temperance meetings were the victims of attack and outrage. The cantonal and police authorities remained for a time indifferent to these excesses, but at last they were forced to take cognizance of them and forbid their meetings. In this latter measure they went so far as to prohibit their assembling in private houses, which gave rise to the

conviction that the free exercise of religion in Switzerland might ultimately be endangered by this measure.

All this induced a number of liberal Christian men of French Switzerland to assemble in Lausanne and establish a "League of Common Justice" that is to extend over all Switzerland. The object of this League is, according to its statutes, "The defense of individual liberty and of all those rights which are guaranteed by the Swiss Constitution." It belongs to no political or religious party, and will reach its goal through the press, public meetings, and all constitutional ways and means. It has published a long list of all occurrences and excesses that have taken place at these Salvation meetings, and have sent it to the national authorities, and it hopes that they may be induced to listen to these complaints and take measures for the exercise of religious liberty in Switzerland, which it now considers endangered. In principle every earnest Christian is in sympathy with the desire of liberty of conscience and religious exercise in Switzerland, but many greatly deplore the *modus operandi* of the Salvation Army. Article 50 of the national Constitution declares that "The free exercise of religious worship is guaranteed within those limits which are conducive to public order and good morals." But it is questionable whether public order, at least, is not greatly disturbed by the demonstrations of the Salvation Army, and it is therefore a question whether this League will find its labor crowned with success.

CHRISTIAN BENEVOLENCE IN POMPEII.

The fearful earthquake last year in Ischia called forth endless ways as a means to gather funds for the relief of the suffering. Some 5,000,000 of francs were collected from public lectures, dramatic festivals, lotteries, balls, concerts, etc., until at last all means of attraction were exhausted. Then an unheard-of enterprise was started which was nothing less than a "Pompeii Redivivus." In the great amphitheater among the ruins the gladiator fights of ancient times were restored, as well as the circus sports, wedding processions, and the funeral trains of the ancients, in which way the heathendom of old was again represented in images of the gods, with pagan priests and vessels for incense, and libations. Even the celebrated chariot races were restored, and the "Emperor Vespasian" condescended to be present at these sports. But the expense for all this was very heavy, amounting to 100,000 francs, while this new style of Christian benevolence only realized 30,000 francs, leaving a deficit of 70,000, for which the "aristocratic committee" now remains responsible. So Christianity has not gained much by this revival of heathen sports; and indeed, from recent discoveries, it was never much indebted to the gods of classic story.

From some of the most recent excavations among the ruins it seems quite clear that the inhabitants of Pompeii were acquainted with Christianity; and that they knew something of the Bible, especially of the Old Testament, appears from some of the fresco wall-paintings there uncovered.

One of these clearly refers to the Bible story of the judgment of King Solomon, the scene of which is represented thus in detail: The King is seated clothed in a white toga, with an upheld scepter in his left hand; on either side stands a minister, one clothed in a white toga, while the other is covered with a green garment. The chairs of these three are on a sort of terrace, behind which is a canopy, and soldiers are holding guard near by. On a table lies the child for whose possession the two mothers are contending. Near by is a soldier ready to execute the command of Solomon to cleave the child in two. Near the table is standing the false mother with a brazen expression, while the real mother is on her knees with uplifted hands appealing to the king. Standing round about is quite a crowd of people gazing curiously at the scene. And now the question arises why an artist of Pompeii should have been induced to depict a scene from the Bible. Was he a Christian or a Jew? A close inspection of the work will induce us to say that he was neither, for the whole is evidently a caricature. The principal personages of the scene are represented as pygmies, with large heads, plump bodies, and short legs. The table on which the child is lying is a butcher's block, the child itself is a distortion, and the butcher has a common cleaver; even he is represented as half-soldier and half-butcher, with a mighty head covered with an immense helmet, from which depends a stupendous horse-tail, so that the whole figure, and indeed the whole scene, induces laughter. The false mother is an extremely ludicrous figure with a broad countenance, and wearing an immense head-gear. The sorrowing mother seems to have been too much for the genial artist; she alone is free from caricature, to which even Solomon is subjected. If the picture is closely inspected it looks very coarse, and one would say that the artist had endeavored to show his rapidity rather than his skill of execution, but this may be said of many of the Pompeiian frescoes, which at a distance appear very artistic. It is a question among archæologists as to whether the artist intended to ridicule the Bible story as such, or whether it was only an outburst of his genial humor, as there are many of just such style of execution on the frescoed walls of the city. But one thing is very certain, and that is, that Christianity was never a success within those walls, not in the olden times as a means of amusement, as it has not been in modern times, as a sort of affected means for the exercise of Christian benevolence.

A REVIVAL AMONG THE CAPUCHIN MONKS.

A remarkable assemblage gathered lately in Rome, such a one as has not been seen there for many years. One hundred and ten Capuchin monks, collected from all quarters of the world, some from America, Hungary, Ireland, and even Africa, held a general chapter for some important elections. The last assemblage of the Capuchins occurred in 1852, and they then elected a Piedmontese as general of the order.

According to the rules of the order, a new election must take place

every six years, and they should have again assembled in 1858. But this was prevented by Pius IX., who seemed to have no great affection for these monks, and preferred to keep them at a distance. He therefore assumed the right of naming the new general, and commanded that they should assemble in general chapter only once in twelve years. At the close of this period the pope again ratified the former election without consulting the order, or even calling them together, and when this general died, in 1873, he appointed another general *motu proprio*.

The dissatisfaction of the Capuchins at this invasion of their rights and this violation of their independence was very great, but they did not venture to offer any resistance.

Leo XIII., however, declared that the order should again assume its full standing, and they were called to a conclave in their great Mission House in Rome. A German-Swiss friar was elected general, a Bavarian as assistant general, and a French monk as second assistant. Among the voters was the venerable figure of the Friar Massaja, who returned to his home last year after an absence of thirty years, as missionary among the Galas. He will soon publish a book in Florence which will describe the missionary work of the Capuchins in Africa. At the present time the order is working in an extremely broad sphere of labor; in Brazil, India, Australia, the Argentine Republic, and Africa; no order has so broad a mission field, but it is a singular fact that while developing its power outside of Europe, it is comparatively without significance in the focus of the Catholic world, where its brilliancy disappears before that star of first magnitude, the Order of the Jesuits. Even the Propaganda takes little interest in the mission work of the Capuchins, and gives to the mission stations of their order but very little financial aid. They are bidden as mendicant monks to accustom themselves to privation, and get their living, where possible, from those among whom and for whom they labor.

Art. XII.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

The present pontiff seems quite inclined to unlock the secrets of the archives of the Vatican, which have hitherto been firmly sealed, at least to all profane eyes. A few months ago he sent a circular to the principal curators of these archives to institute the most searching studies into these treasures. This circular seems to have been attended with the best of results. Cardinal Hergenröther, the archivist of the pontifical chair, has just given to the world the first volume of the documents of the reign of Leo X., of which there are no less than 2,348, which are said to have been issued during a few months' reign of this pope. This volume is the work of men of various shades, who have been summoned by the cardinal as co-operators, and who have carefully examined 230 volumes and manuscripts, some of which were found outside of the Vatican

Library. It is said that twelve volumes of this kind are to follow in quick succession, and the second one is to reveal the history of the German Reformation. The Hungarian clergy are showing a very great zeal in this line, and have just published the first two volumes of their collection, entitled the "Vatican Documents of the Kingdom of Hungary."

A famous German commentator has just perfected an instructive study on "Luther as an Expositor of the Old Testament." Prof. Zöckler in this work treats of the theoretical and practical value of the greatest work of Luther in this field, which is found in his printed lectures on Genesis, delivered on various occasions from 1536 to 1545. He shows that Luther acknowledged and maintained the necessity of close grammatical and historical exposition, in contradistinction to some of his predecessors, but that in the dogmatical interpretation he took a wide field and quite often erred in his allegorical demonstrations. From this he infers that the actual expositional worth is not very great, and that its significance lies in its theological and ecclesiastical direction. Zöckler finds therein a rich treasure for dogmatics and polemics against the errors of the Romish Church and of the enthusiasts, and shows what an inexhaustible mine for Christian ethics and worldly wisdom these lectures contain, as well as information regarding the significant events and words of celebrated men. Zöckler's valuable document closes with a few hints as to the effect of this commentary on the exegesis of Genesis, and considers it the ripest work of the Reformer in the field of Scripture exposition.

The Bible Society of France distributed last year 35,344 Bibles or sections of the Bible in France, Algiers, and Numidia. In this work it spent 50,000 francs, and at the same time by great energy wiped out its deficit of 15,000 francs. But it then reported a new gap in the treasury to the amount of 16,000 francs, incurred in the production and printing of the revised Bible, to cover which the friends of the Bible in France are again appealed to by Bersier and Berg, Piccard and Recolin, the text of whose addresses was: "Remain, as were your fathers, a people of the Bible." The Tract Society was also very active during the year last past in impressing the very important principle that in the distribution of small religious documents their weight consists in the quality of what is offered more than in the quantity. The directors of the society, at their annual meeting, strongly emphasized the desire that as much as possible the tracts should be sold and not given away, as the people prize and examine what they had paid for with their own money more than that which had been given to them. The income for the year amounted to 53,146 francs, and the expenses to 54,487. Eighty church societies join in this work. The annual report of the society for the aid of theological students shows an income of 8,402 francs against an outlay of 7,460. As a prize and encouragement to faithful students they receive a savings-bank book with a small credit.

A pamphlet has just been issued in Germany by the Catholic authorities with the title of "The Culture and Education of the Clergy." Some suppose it to be from the hands of a bishop, and others from those of a director of a Catholic Theological Seminary. It undertakes to show with very painful care, by chapters and subchapters and divisions and subdivisions, statistically and historically, theoretically and practically, from the past and the present, that the only profitable development of the young Catholic theologians can come from their education according to Tridentine form in an institution supported by the Church and under the control of the bishop. The life of the German students in the state universities is painted in the darkest colors, while the lightest shades are thrown on that of the incipient priests within the walls of the clerical school. The author frankly confesses that a deeper scientific knowledge and a clearer insight in the inner connection of the sciences may be obtained for their *learned* theologians at the universities. But for the preparation for the cure of souls, learning is much less required than practical piety. The assertion is made that the study of theology rests mainly on authority, and that all necessary knowledge for the exercise of the priestly office may be obtained in the seminaries. The young clericals are there also imbued with patriotism and the love of the fatherland, as well as a high regard for its institutions. An antidote to this work is just announced that proposes to show the necessity of university training for the clergy, but it has not yet reached the public.

The thirteenth volume of the Encyclopedia for Protestant Theology, begun by Dr. Herzog and now continued by Dr. Hauck, has just appeared; and in it we are informed that the work cannot be finished in fifteen volumes, but will probably require seventeen, with the index included. No one will complain of this, as even that number will scarcely be enough to allow room for the large amount of new matter that will necessarily be crowded in the later volumes. The one just issued is a new proof of the scientific excellence of the entire undertaking. Extending from Bishop Ritschl to Scotus, it contains much that is new, especially concerning personalities just deceased, such as Rudelbach, Rückert, Schöberlein, Schubert, and Roth. The work of the ecclesiastical statistics is more than usually valuable, because the most of them are perfectly new; they are mainly from Russia, Saxony, Scotland, and Switzerland. The historical articles have a fullness in some instances not heretofore attained. The Protestant law of divorce is treated quite extensively in accordance with the changes recently made in this field. The author gives a concise and thorough compendium on this subject of forty-six pages. Taken all in all, the volume is worthy of its predecessors. The mechanical execution is also excellent, and the public will owe the publishers hearty thanks for finishing this valuable work in so creditable a way.

A unique addition to the Jewish polemics of the period is found in a modern Epistle to the Hebrews by "Saul." It is one of the most impor-

tant productions which has appeared from the Jewish side of the Jewish question during the later period of the discussion. The author has chosen for himself the name of Saul, and his Semitic and human consciousness equally revolt against this modern Jewry, which is ruled, as he says, by "capitalism;" his Jewish, because among his people there is no unity born of a high idea, and his human consciousness, because their profit is quite sure to be gained by the injury of others. The Jews have received their severest wound in their so-called "emancipation," because it has completely deprived them of their Christian character and has driven them into the worship of said "capitalism." Patriotic earnestness and patriotic hope have inspired the author with the essence of his epistle; and confessions of a similar kind that have lately been often repeated by the Jews belong to the most remarkable and satisfactory signs of the times. A quite important development of this kind is a recent expression of the Jews of southern Russia, bearing the title of "Sowing in Hope." In another work, in thirteen theses, the Jews of a certain district appeal to their fellows to listen to the words of their "Brother Jesus," and thus to seek peace with the nations. These developments are certainly very remarkable.

"Positive Christianity and Orthodox Pietism" is the title of a pamphlet recently issued concerning the unfortunate conflict between two wings of the German Protestant Church. The orthodox Germans claim that these so-called "positive Christians" have not a great deal of positive Christianity, and the object of this publication is an endeavor to make a reconciliation between the thoughtful men of the conservative side and all the earnest minds of the so-called liberal and enlightened side. But the trouble about the pamphlet is that the stand-point of the author lies, not between the parties, but rather in close juxtaposition to the Liberal party. So from the beginning these mediators in the conflict are not impartial. And the same may be said of their theological stand-point. They speak very lightly of the "traditional doctrine" of the Trinity, and declare that the assertions regarding Jesus in the Gospel of John, and in Paul, from which their opponents are led to believe in pre-existence of Jesus, are enigmatical and ambiguous. The pamphlet was written by two hands, one belonging to an intelligent layman and the other to a theologian; but in their effort to make a basis of reconciliation between the right and the left, they use certain expressions indicating that certain gospels are falsely so-called, and take other positions in regard to orthodox theology that are quite incompatible with any idea of mediation. It is not at all probable that this extreme liberal wing of the Christian world of Germany will in this way withdraw any of the bolts that are now closed on them by the orthodox Churches.

Dr. Warneck is becoming the great authority in the German mission field, and at a late Continental Missionary Conference, held in Bremen, his essay on missionary control was, in his absence, read and received with much favor. He is making an effort to have the mission work in

heathen lands as far as possible sustained by the governmental influences of the countries whence the missionaries come. His position is that divisions among the missionaries in their fields of labor, and especially among those from the same land, are prejudicial to the success of the workers. In the course of the debate, induced by the reading of his paper, there was a very general expression of opinion that the tendency to develop missionary work in harmony with his views would be a wholesome one if well guarded; but one of the orators, referring to the early history of missions and the coolness shown toward them by most governments, warned them against being too ready to extend the finger, lest the entire hand be taken.

ART. XIII.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

The Resurrection of Our Bodies that Die. Pamphlet, 8vo, pp. 123. Eureka, Portland: B. Thurston & Co. 1881.

Outlines of the Doctrine of the Resurrection. Biblical, Historical, and Scientific. By Rev. R. J. COOKE, M.A. With an Introduction by D. D. WHEDON, LL.D 12mo. New York: Phillips & Hunt.

Beyond the Grave. Reviewed by L. B. CALDWELL, Professor of Physics in East Tennessee Wesleyan University, Athens, Tenn. 12mo, pp. 152. Philadelphia: A. T. Zeising & Co.

We group these three works together, for notice and brief review, because of their substantial unity of design, and the similarity of their principal arguments, though they differ in some incidental things. The first is without the author's proper name, or other *data* by which its authorship may be known, further than what is given on the title-page. It is well written, in good temper and taste, and—abating somewhat our praise in view of the writer's over-confident dogmatizing, and his readiness to denounce all who dissent from his views as heretics, and, if Methodists, false to their profession—we may call it an altogether commendable piece of work. The second has already been pretty fully represented to our readers, first in an editorial "notice" in these pages, and next by its reviews and commendations in the Church press. It is written in an earnest and florid style, somewhat indicative of the fact that it is its author's first work. The book is, in its literary aspects, a creditable one, and the reader will think well of the writer, though he may not approve his methods of argumentation nor concur in all his conclusions. The third is a review of Bishop Foster's "Beyond the Grave,"

earnestly dissenting from both its methods and conclusions, though praising its style and its dialectic skill at some points. But neither in respect to fairness nor good taste is it altogether satisfactory, and its attempts at ridicule and sarcasm are unworthy of the subject and the occasion.

These writers are all in the same plane of thought, and their presuppositions and processes, and the conclusions to which they come, are substantially identical; and they are also in harmony with the commonly prevalent (especially among the unscholarly) notions upon the subject, to wit, that at some future time the material bodies of all who shall have lived and died of the children of Adam will be rehabilitated and restored to life, to become again the abodes of the souls which from the death of Abel to the great consummation shall have subsisted for longer or shorter terms without such bodies. The writers who defend this notion usually accept some theory by which to surmount its confessed difficulties. Some have supposed the existence of a joint or ganglion which is the center or germ of the bodily identity; and that around this is to be gathered so much of earthy matter as may be needful to constitute a resurrection body. Other theories equally fanciful are well known; but to the credit of the writers now under review, it must be said that they fight shy of such theorizings, and refer the whole matter to the power of God.

In support of their views these writers so accept and apply certain well-known words of Scripture that they necessarily sustain their positions. The word "resurrection," ἔγερσις and ἀνάστασις, is quietly assumed to signify only the resuscitation of dead bodies, which is simply begging the question at issue, since others give quite another sense to them. In like manner, it is assumed that the resurrection of Christ, of which so much use is made in the apostolic writings, can have no other meaning than the quickening of the body that was laid in Joseph's tomb, and also that the body in which Jesus appeared during the forty days next ensuing did certainly ascend into heaven, where now, "in our nature," (which they understand of his physical body,) he is seated at God's right hand, and thence he will come again in that same material body to judge the world. Of the correctness or otherwise of this exegesis we say nothing; but as it is precisely at this point that objections to the theory of "the resurrection of our bodies that die" comes in, it might be well to give some little attention to these objections. It is claimed by objectors

that the design of what is written in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians was intended to comfort believers with the assurance of the future life, and that by exchanging the word "resurrection" in that place for some word to express simply the future felicity of the saints, would not only meet all the requirements of the language used, but also better preserve the harmony of its ideas; and also obviate the seeming contradiction which is involved in making the declaration that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" mean something wholly different from its natural import.

The resurrection of Christ is certainly among the great central truths of Christianity, whether that fact is accepted as simply implying the bringing to life the body that was crucified, or as something accomplished in the spirit world, where the disembodied Christ spoiled Death in his own dominion, and came forth from his prison a conqueror. This act, performed in *hades*, by our Lord acting in his Messianic character, was itself, say those who account it "THE Resurrection," a work of redemption, which was itself to "the spirits in prison" an assurance of their ἐγερσις, "arising." It is not our purpose to either defend or assert the correctness of this exegesis, but only to suggest that till its incorrectness has been shown it will not do to ignore it in a polemical setting forth of an opposite theory.

It is conceded that the physical and literalistic theory of the resurrection and of the future life has all along borne rule in theological statements and in the popular beliefs. It has, accordingly, become embodied in the sermonology and the hymnology of the Church. It was an integral part of the Catholic orthodoxy of the Church of the Middle Ages, and it was accepted almost entirely unchanged by the Protestant Churches of the Reformation. It is quite certain, however, that these views are not so generally or tenaciously held as they were formerly; and not a few of our best scholars, and among them some whose general orthodoxy cannot be impugned, are bold to announce other views and opinions. One of the books under notice directly antagonizes what has been written and published by one of our Bishops, and as that Bishop has not been called to account for what he has written, it may be assumed that the disputed tenet is not considered an integral part of Methodist orthodoxy. It will be wise for disputants on this subject to bear this in mind, and temper accordingly their denunciations of what they are pleased to stigmatize as heresy.

Dr. Lyman Abbott, whose soundness in the faith we will neither assert nor deny, but whose critical ability and exegetical force must be conceded, in a very able paper, published not very long ago in the "Christian Union," discussing anew what he had some time before said more briefly in a Sunday-school lesson on 1 Corinthians xv, reiterates his formerly expressed doubts, and more fully elaborates his own views of the New Testament doctrine of the resurretion. We submit his words, not as our own, but as a statement of the subject entirely in harmony with evangelical Christianity, and not so palpably wrong as to be unworthy of the candid consideration of those who prefer to be right rather than to follow blindly in the "traditions of the fathers."

Having declared against the popular and traditional faith, Dr. Abbott proceeds to say:

> My faith, both in what it asserts and what it denies, rests *wholly upon Scripture.* I have no faith in any guesses about the future, nor in any philosophical conclusions, expressed in such forms as, We must suppose, or, We must believe; nor in any mere deductions of feelings expressed in such phrases as, I cannot bear the thought, etc. All that we know or can know about the resurrection is to be gathered by a reverent study of Revelation. What such a study will not teach us we must be content to leave unknown. . . . I do not believe in the resurrection of the body; because I think it is clearly, explicitly, and vigorously repudiated by the word of God.

He then refers to, and quotes from, the Westminster Catechism, the Lesser Catechism, and the Thirty-nine Articles, to show that those venerable standards which have so largely dominated the religious thought of English-speaking Protestantism, all teach the very doctrine that he repudiates and antagonizes, and to their statements he responds:

> I believe that Christ did truly rise from death, [the *dead*, *νέκρους*;] but I do not believe that he took his body, flesh and bones, into heaven. I believe that before the ascension his material body underwent the change which Paul foretells for those who are living at the coming of Christ; I believe that Christ is a spirit, and I believe his own declaration to his disciples after his resurrection, "A spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." I believe flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. I believe it is no part of the perfection of man's nature, but his temporary instrument, admirably adapted to his state of pilgrimage, utterly unadapted to his eternal home. And I believe this, as I have said, on what seems to me to be the clear teaching of God's holy word.

After a somewhat extended rehearsal of the arguments *pro* and *con* upon the subject, he closes with the following, with the spirit of which no fault can be found, whatever may be thought of the arguments and conclusions:

> That we are to be not unclothed, but clothed upon; that we are to have a glorious body, a spiritual body, a celestial body, a body redeemed from all suffering and sensuous temptation and fleshly sin, all that belongs to flesh and blood, seems to me to be at once the clear revelation of Scripture and the reasonable expecta-

tion of every child of God; for has not our Father taught us, by the wonderful provisions which he has made for our pilgrimage, to expect still greater things in our home? That this incorruptible body may have some now uncomprehended and incomprehensible relation to the physical, earthy, sensuous, decaying tabernacle of our pilgrimage, I see neither reason to affirm nor to deny. Whether God gives us a new garment in place of an old one cast aside, or whether he evolves it out of the cast-off garment as the pure white paper is evolved from the unkempt rags, or the radiant flower from the decaying seed, I do not know, and I am not curious to know. If any one likes to think the latter, and to find in Paul's figure of the seed some ground for this opinion, and in this opinion some justification for repeating the traditional utterance of the Creed, "I believe in the resurrection of the body," I have no dispute with him. But for myself, whenever I join with my brethren in repeating that sublime symbol of the faith of the Holy Catholic Church, the Apostles' Creed, I always substitute for the unscriptural phrase, "The resurrection of the body," this other, the warrant for which both Christ and Paul furnish to the believer:

I BELIEVE IN THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD.

The subject is one to be calmly and reverently considered, in the light of God's word; and nothing is to be gained by denouncing any one as a heretic for accepting, in its literal truthfulness, St. Paul's explicit declaration, "Flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God."

The Life of Christ. By DR. BERNHARD WEISS. Counselor of the Consistory, and Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated by M. G. HOPE. Vol. III. 8vo, pp. 428. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford.

The concluding volume of Dr. Weiss's "Life of Christ" fully sustains, and indeed enlarges and brightens, the characteristics that have been indicated in the notices of the first and second volumes. The portion of that wonderful story here given covers the last few months of our Lord's ministry, particularly his final and fatal visit to Jerusalem, his triumphant entry, his discourses in the temple, the last passover, the betrayal, trial, and crucifixion, the resurrection, the subsequent abode in the flesh, and the ascension, and in the relation of these all of the writer's peculiarities of manner and style, of thoughts and opinions, are fully brought into view. The same freedom in dealing with the statements of the evangelists that has been noticed in the former volumes is still used, but the heart of the writer is evidently brought into a more lively sympathy with his theme, and accordingly the narrative becomes more tender and exultant.

It may have seemed that the subject of these volumes had been treated with all needful fullness before their appearance, and yet it must be conceded that they make a valuable contribution to that department of Christian literature; and while they should be read only with an intelligent and careful discrimination, yet, if so read, they will prove decidedly and eminently instructive.

The writer's mental stand-point is not that of nearly all English-speaking Protestants, and many will think his views and statements less reverent and conservative; but this very difference may enhance their practical value without damaging the reader's appreciation of the subject in hand. As a review of the evangelistic story, after it has been fully learned from the gospels and considered as collated by some of our admirable lives of Christ, this work will be found both instructive and edifying.

Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures. By HENRY M. HARMAN, D.D., Professor of Greek and Hebrew in Dickinson College. (Revised Edition.) 8vo, pp. 798. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe.

The first edition of Professor Harman's "Introduction" was published five or six years ago, and it at once attracted very considerable attention among biblical scholars. The criticisms that appeared in the periodical press, though not always and in every thing commendatory, still very clearly indicated a decidedly high appreciation of the work. But in respect to Old Testament criticism only a few years marks a wide change, and, to meet the changed condition of the subject, the author has thoroughly revised the whole work for a new edition, devoting especial attention to the Pentateuch. The results of his re-reading of the recent discussions of the subject are embodied in the work as it now stands, so that it may be accepted as "abreast with the times." Having accompanied the critics of the Wellhausen, Kuenen, and Robertson Smith school through all their discussions, and re-examined all their objections, he re-affirms his unchanged conviction that all the books of the Pentateuch, as they now stand, are substantially as Moses wrote them, not including a few editorial notes which are readily recognized as additions. As that whole matter must be determined almost entirely on internal evidence, only the testimony of experts can be used in respect to which form of testimony, whether in the law courts or in criticism, lay folks have come to be somewhat skeptical. As compared with Dr. Terry, (see articles in the last and the present numbers of this "Review,") Dr. Harman is decidedly the more conservative, and, having read the former, and mentally assented to his conclusions, we now find that the latter makes out a good case in favor of some of the long-accepted opinions which the former seems ready to abandon at the behests of the critics.

The changes and additions made for this new edition certainly add very considerably to the value of the work, which, having

already won for itself an advanced position in its own departments of learning, will be able to hold it the more securely by reason of these valuable additions. As a comprehensive manual we know of no other book in the language that so well meets all the requirements of the case.

The Doctrine of Divine Love; or, Outlines of the Moral Theology of the Evangelical Church. By ERNEST SARTORIUS, Doctor of Theology, etc., at Königsberg. Translated by SOPHIA TAYLOR. 8vo, pp. 378. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford.

Ernest Sartorius has, with confessed fitness, been styled the St. John of German Lutheranism. The period of his public activity, extending from 1821, when he first appeared as an author, down to 1856, when he died at the height of his activity, was simultaneous with that of the rise, prevalence, and decline of German rationalism, to combat which was his life-long endeavor. His successive discussions, afterward collected into a single treatise of "The Doctrine of Divine Love," constitute his chief title to a place among theological authorities, though his other works were voluminous and important. The ruling thought of this work is that in order to understand and appreciate the revelation which God has made of himself and his purposes in Holy Scripture, the subject must be viewed from the stand-point of divine love; and that although God is manifested in various ways to men's natural understanding, he can be truly apprehended only as he is manifested in Christ, impelled by love to man, "reconciling the world to himself." And from this initial point he proceeds to set forth the great doctrines of the Gospel, following the order of the Augsburg documents, which he fully indorses and explains in their manifest evangelical character and design. The work has not only an historical value as marking a stage in the progress of theological thought in Germany, but is also of perpetual value as an able presentation of the theology of the heart, and that, too, without any admixture of mystical antinomianism, against which it is a decided and emphatic protest.

Christ Preaching to Spirits in Prison; or, Christ Preaching to the Dead Explained by the Change from the Inferior to the Celestial Paradise. By REV. WILLIAM DELOSS LOVE, South Hadley, Mass. 18mo, pp. 167. Boston: Congregational S. S. and Publishing House.

The famous passage, 1 Peter iii, 19, 20, with its perhaps kindred one in chapter iv, 6, has afforded no little exercise, labor, or amusement to those who fancy obscure passages of Scripture.

Mr. Love has his theory, which is not beyond the bounds of the accepted orthodoxy. The spirits referred to were antediluvians to whom Noah preached, who were abiding in *hades*, (not *gehenna*,) to which Christ came "in the Spirit" after his crucifixion, and there made known to those whom he found there their assured redemption; that somehow this preaching prepared the way for the betterment of their condition when he should have "ascended up on high." Probably the conclusion to which the writer comes is clearer to his own mental vision than he succeeds in making it to the minds of most of his readers.

Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Gospel of John. By HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM MEYER, Th.D. Translated from the Fifth Edition of the German by WILLIAM URWICK, M.A. The Translation Revised and Edited by FREDERICK CROMBIE, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature at St. Andrews, with a Preface and Supplementary Notes to the American edition by A. C. KENDRICK, D.D., Greek Professor in the University of Rochester, N. Y. 8vo, pp. 565. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. $3.

We have, in noticing other volumes of this edition of Meyer's Commentary, indicated our high appreciation of the work itself, as it came from the hands of its gifted author, and also of the special excellences of this American reprint, with the additions and improvements made in it as compared with the Edinburgh edition; and what was there said will apply without abatement to this additional volume. There seems, indeed, to have existed a peculiar affinity of mind and spirit between the commentator and the work in hand, when he prepared his exegesis of John's Gospel, by which the inner life of the evangelist is drawn out with great beauty and fullness in the Commentary, so constituting it a devotional as well as an intellectual treatise. As will be seen by the title given above, besides the original author, three scholarly hands have united to increase the available value of the book. The double translation is a happy arrangement by which to fully transfer the thoughts expressed in one language into not only the words, but also the idioms and methods of expression, of another, the lack of which is often felt in works only half-way translated out of the German. The American editor, who is well known as no second-rate biblical scholar, has also enriched this edition with many highly valuable critical and illustrative notes, usually appended to each chapter. We again congratulate our American biblical students, and all critical readers of the New Testament, in view of their opportunity to possess, at a comparatively cheap rate, a commentary of such sterling value.

A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Philippians. By the Late JOHN EADIE, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis to the United Presbyterian Church. Second edition. Edited by the REV. W. YOUNG, M.A., Glasgow. 8vo, pp. 292. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford.

The name of Dr. Eadie is a sufficient guarantee for both the requisite learning and scholarship and the evangelical orthodoxy of all that he may have written. His commentaries are especially valuable, combining as they do abundant wealth of biblical erudition with the deepest and richest displays of spirituality. His choice of the three epistles—those to the Ephesians, the Philippians, and the Colossians, the eminently spiritual ones—may suggest what were his own religious affinities, which are also abundantly illustrated in his treatment of his chosen subjects; and while in scholarship he will not suffer in comparison with any other in the same field, his profound and clear spiritual insight into and appreciation of the deeper interior purport of the apostolic lessons imparts a special value to his works. Any who may study these commentaries will be sure to be instructed as to the sense of the apostle's words, and if this shall be done with a teachable spirit and a receptive heart the spiritual advantage will not be less marked than the intellectual.

The Apostles' Creed, Tested by Experience. Lectures in the Church of the Messiah, Brooklyn. By C. R. BAKER. 12mo, pp. 133. New York: Thomas Whittaker.

The Apostles' Creed is among the most ancient of the post-apostolic writings for the instruction of believers. It is called the "Apostles'" because it is given as an embodiment of the teaching which had come down to its date as the substance of apostolic doctrine, and not, as some have supposed, as a doctrinal statement formulated by the apostles themselves. And though it is so very brief, as compared with some of the creeds of modern times, yet who can say that it fails to set forth, either explicitly or by natural implication, all that it is essential for a Christian to believe for his soul's comfort?

The author of this little volume made the Creed the text, both to direct the course of his public teaching, and to suggest those spiritual instructions which the truths of the Gospel are so well adapted to impart, and to impart which is among the most important designs of the preaching of the Gospel. It is equally valuable for private and devotional study, and especially because it builds its structure of instructions and reproofs and doctrines upon the almost universally accepted truths of religion.

History, Biography, and Topography.

A Catholic Dictionary, containing some Account of the Doctrine, Discipline, Rites, Ceremonies, Councils, and Religious Orders of the Catholic Church. By WILLIAM E. ADDIS and THOMAS ARNOLD, M.A. Third edition. 8vo, pp. 900. New York: The Catholic Publication Society Company. 1884.

As it has become the fashion to have dictionaries and cyclopedias of every department of science, or art, or literature, our neighbors of the Roman Catholic Church have also deemed it desirable that their system should have its dictionary; and accordingly the goodly volume whose title stands at the head of this article is the response to that requirement. Its coming is indeed no cause for surprise, but on the contrary it is rather remarkable that the place it is designed to fill has so long stood empty; and it is known that such a work has been for some years in contemplation, but has been delayed for a variety of causes. Its publication is a sign, additional to many others that have appeared during late years, of the purpose of the Catholic hierarchy and priesthood not to permit their cause to suffer before English-speaking people through any default of the needed defense. If, as they say, their history has been written by their enemies, and their portraiture drawn in caricature, they seem to be determined that it shall be so no longer, and therefore they go at work to tell their own story, and to delineate for public observation the lineaments of their system, all of which they not only have the right to do, but they are bound to do it in fidelity to their trust.

It is a maxim of common observation that very much of a story is in the telling, and very few persons would wish to have their cases presented to even the most impartial tribunal by their confessed adversaries. It may also be presumed that our histories of the popes and of the Reformation, of the horrors of St. Bartholomew's day and of the crusades against the Waldenses, would read differently, though perhaps not more truthfully, in a Romish instead of a Protestant version. And so the Roman Catholics choose that their own people (and all others as well) may receive the account of these things from their friends.

The work is the joint production of two English scholars, who are named on the title-page. The American reprint has been carefully revised and corrected, and considerably enlarged by the addition of matters relating to affairs in this country, and the book bears the *imprimaturs* of Cardinals Manning and M'Closkey, so that the faithful may be assured of the safety of what is given

them. As a literary production it is decidedly praiseworthy, learned, and well written. Its temper, too, is admirable, being quite free from the belligerency and the sneering manner that are often so offensively conspicuous in even the higher class of Roman Catholic productions, at least in this country. Though it is a manifest design of the whole work to present to both Catholic and Protestant readers the Romanist version of the thousands of facts and doctrinal statements which have become commonplaces in the public mind, and by so doing to reverse or modify the popular judgment respecting them, still there is very little ostensible pleading, but a kind of quiet assumption that here is the truth, and all to the contrary must be set aside; and for its purpose this is admirably done—skillfully, some would say; others, jesuitically.

As seen in this presentation of its many features, and the details of its history, and the statements of its practices, it is made to appear to the ordinary Protestant reader that Romanism is not so black as it has been painted. But any who come to the examination of the subject, not so much a learner as a critic, with sufficient knowledge of the matters treated of, will not fail to detect its specially apologetic character, not in its style, however, but in its substance. It is, in fact, a plea, but so conducted as to avoid all appearance of controversy, and so to disarm opposition; and without conceding the general truthfulness of the presentations made, it may be granted that not a few popular mistakes are corrected, and new light is thrown on many points usually not well understood.

But notwithstanding its learning and apparent liberality of views, it is quite manifest that this work is thoroughly and completely "ultramontane" in its character, as, indeed, must be every other *approved* Roman Catholic work. The absolute supremacy and the infallibility of the papacy, and for the time being of the pope personally, are every-where and always assumed, so making "obedience" in thought and action the one and sole duty of all the faithful, and alike those of high and low degree. What the pope declares must be accepted as certainly correct, whether in respect to faith or duty. Private judgment is presumption, and the learned criticism of the Scriptures is essential impiety. These things are not flaunted in this work, nor are they denied, but instead they are every-where tacitly assumed, and used on all occasions. This doctrine of papal supremacy makes reformation impossible, and in the presence of such infallibility the thought of error in the doctrines of the Church must be not only absurd.

but impious. For these reasons the Church of Rome is and must be out of harmony with the spirit of the nineteenth century. Its golden age was the Dark Ages, the era of unreasoning and uninquiring faith, and the progress of modern times has been made not simply in opposition to its spirit, but also despite its active resistance. That it feels the influence of the changed atmosphere of English-speaking Christendom, and realizes the necessity of adapting its speech to it, this learned and adroitly written dictionary is proof; and yet in presenting such a work its authors and promulgators have earned the thanks of all who ask for only the truth, and who desire that every interest may be fairly stated, so that it can be judged on its merits.

Miscellaneous.

Short History of Christian Missions: From Abraham and Paul to Carey, Livingstone, and Duff. By GEORGE SMITH, LL.D., F.R.G.S., etc. 12mo, pp. 226. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford.

Within the lids of this little volume the compiler has brought together, in good order, but necessarily in the briefest form of words, a sketch of the principal evangelistic movements of the Church in all ages. As a catalogue and summary of facts and dates it will be useful, but it is quite too brief to answer the requirements of a history. The missions of the British Wesleyan Church are dispatched in twelve lines, and those of the Methodist Episcopal Church in eight.

The Life of St. Paul. By REV. JAMES STALKER, M.A., Kirkcaldy. 12mo, pp. 149. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Scribner & Welford.

This, as also that above noticed, is among the "Hand-books for Bible Classes and Private Students," prepared by Marcus Dods and Alexander Whyte. The work here given is valuable and suited to its design.

College Greek Course in English. By WILLIAM CLEAVER WILKINSON. 12mo, pp. 302. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe.

Following out the Chicago idea, Dr. Vincent has projected an "After-School Series" of readings, chiefly made up of the matter usually read in the school courses in Latin and Greek, translations of which Professor Wilkinson is putting into book shape. Two volumes appeared before the present one, containing respectively the Preparatory Course in Latin, and in Greek, done into good English. We now have the College Course in Greek, and that for the Latin is promised. The idea is a good one, and for

the class of persons for whom these books are designed they cannot fail to be useful.

A Vindication of the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch. By CHARLES ELLIOTT, D.D., Professor in Hebrew in Lafayette College, Easton, Pa. 18mo, pp. 273. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe.

This is among the early replications—of which a multitude is sure to follow, of all degrees of ability—to the aggressive antagonism developed by the "Higher Criticism" against the traditional views of the Church respecting the authorship of the earlier books of the Bible. It is less elaborate than some others, and seems to be intended for general rather than for special students, and for the use of such its comparative brevity and its less elaborate methods may be real advantages.

How the Bible was Made. By the Rev. E. M. WOOD, D.D. 18mo, pp. 263. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe.

A Methodist minister, occupied with the duties of the pastorate, finds time and occasion also to inform himself respecting the living questions of the times, especially in reference to the great truths of religion; and as just now the attacks of the enemy are directed against the Bible, so he comes to the defense by detailing the processes by which our Bible came into form. The book here offered does not pretend to originality as to its matter, but seeks to present old and well-known truths in such array as best to defeat the onsets of learned skepticism, and to point out to honest inquirers the grounds and reasons for their faith in the written word. It is a book that may be studied with profit.

Christina; or, the Persecuted Family. A Tale of Sorrow and Suffering, Founded on a Chapter in the History of the Vaudois; by Rev. J. DILLON. 16mo, pp. 232. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1884.

A readable story, from that apparently inexhaustible mine of religious romance, the history of the Vaudois,

> "Who kept God's word so faithfully of old,
> When all our fathers worshiped stocks and stones."

The Doctrines of God's Holy Word, as Held in the Methodist Episcopal Church. By REV. JAMES MUDGE, B.D. 12mo, pp. 87. Lucknow, (India:) American Methodist Mission Press.

HARPER'S FRANKLIN SQUARE LIBRARY: *A Fair Country Maid.* A Novel. By E. FAIRFAX BYRRNE.—*Godfrey Helstone.* A Novel. By GEORGIANA M. CRAIK.—*My Ducats and My Daughter.* A Novel.—*A Perilous Secret.* A Novel. By CHARLES READE.—"*I Say No.*" A Novel. By WILKIE COLLINS.—*Lucia, Hugh, and Another.* By Mrs. J. H. NEEDELL.—*Venus's Doves.* A Novel. By IDA ASHWORTH TAYLOR.—*Lancelot Ward, M.P.* By GEORGE TEMPLE.

A Perilous Secret. By CHARLES READE, author of "Hard Cash," etc. 18mo. paper covers, pp. 160. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The Miz-Maze. A Story. By Nine Authors. 18mo, pp. 212. New York: Harper & Brothers.

INDEX.

Abbott, Dr., on his Christian Faith..Page 788
Addis and Arnold: A Catholic Dictionary. 793
African Population, The Problem of Our. 107
Elevating effects of interbreeding.... 117
Amalgamation, Bp. G. Haven on..117-119
Political grievances of our colored people should be extinguished.120, 122
The "color line."..... 124
Education..... 126
Age of Steel, Creators of the..... 601
Agnosticism of Hume and Huxley..... 601
America and Europe, Gossip about..... 204
American Antiquarian and Oriental Journal.....157, 763
Apostles, Teaching of the Twelve..... 697
Argument, The Great..... 590
Armstrong, His Work of Evangelization in Spain..... 577
Art, Christian, Archæology of..... 582
Atonement, Methodist Doctrine of the.... 278
Historically and doctrinally fundamental..... 278
Necessary to growth of Protestantism. 279
Views of Drs. Miley and Summers on 282
Dr. Pope on.....290, 291
Extract from writer's "Tract"...293-294
Extracts from Pope's "Compendium"..... 297, 298
Atte: Archæology of Christian Art..... 582
Austria, Protestant Work in..... 393
Avignon, The Popes at..... 678
Baden, The Old Catholics in..... 177
Badley: Westminster Abbey..... 449
Baker: The Apostles' Creed, Tested by Experience..... 792
Baker: The Mystery of Creation and Man 601
Baldwin: The Opium Traffic in China.... 420
Ball of the Vegetables, and other Stories in Prose and Verse..... 208
Baptist Missionary Magazine..... 758
Belgian Mission Church, The..... 176
Bible Society of France—Sketch of its work during the last year..... 781
Bible Claims.....180-183
Biblical Study..... 184
Bibliotheca Sacra.....160, 348, 561, 759
Bishop: Old Mexico and Her Lost Provinces..... 208
Blackie: Sound Bodies for Boys and Girls 600
Blackmore: The Remarkable History of Sir Thomas Upmore, Bart, M.P..... 601
Bose, Ram Chandra: Brahmoism..... 597
Bose, Ram Chandra: Gossip about America and Europe..... 204
Bost, Pasteur: Dictionary of Ecclesiastical History..... 179
Bowen: Logic of Religious Belief, The.. 642
Boy Travelers in the Far East, The..... 208
Boyle: Heroes of Christian History..... 599
Boys and Girls, Sound Bodies for..... 600
Brahmoism..... 597
Bridgegate: Lessons on the Life of Jesus 204
Briggs: Biblical Study..... 184
Buchanan, James, Life of..... 594
Bruce: The Parabolic Teaching of Christ 208
Burrows: The Doom of the Majority of Mankind..... 600
Buttz: The Gnomic Aorist in the New Testament..... 387
Byrne: A Fair Country Maid..... 601
Calloway: Letters and Memorials of Jane Welsh Carlyle.....Page 60
Carlyle, Jane Welsh, Letters and Memorials of..... 60
The saddest and cheerfulest of beings 66
Her literary productions, womanly genius..... 66
Her letters and memorials pronounced by the "Boston Post" "the finest of the nineteenth century."..... 68
Carroll: The Catholic Dogma of Church Authority..... 716
Castelnau, M., on the Separation of Church and State.....575, 576
Catholic World.....350, 561, 764
Catholic Dogma of Church Authority, The 716
Scarcity of modern Catholic sermon literature..... 718
Baptism..... 720
Dogma of supreme authority of the Church..... 721
Infallibility of the Catholic Church.722, 723
Denial of the Bible to the laity..... 728
The Bible subordinated to the authority of the Church..... 729
Doctrine of mass..... 732
Grave errors, quotation from Cardinal Newman..... 737
Luther quoted..... 737
Centenary Thoughts for the Pew and Pulpit of Methodism..... 596
Christianity and Humanity..... 402
Christina..... 796
Christian Thought, Monthly.....158, 757
Christian Harem, The..... 709
Christ Preaching to Spirits in Prison..... 790
Christ, The Public Teaching of..... 208
Christ, The Life of..... 788
Christ's Resurrection and Ascension, Studies in the Forty Days between..... 600
Church of England, Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the..... 185
Church and State, Separation of 575, 576
City Mission Work Abroad..... 580
Clark, Dr. Elphalet..... 148
His early education, and settlement as a physician..... 149
As a leader..... 152
As physician and friend..... 154
As a man of affairs..... 155
Christian character and death..... 156
Clark's Foreign Theological Library..... 381
Clergy, The Culture and Education of the. 782
Clerical Library, The..... 204
Cobb: Article on Divine Foreknowledge. 169
Inconsistency of his reasoning ...164-167
College Greek Course in English..... 795
Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Philippians..... 794
Conflict of Centuries..... 192
Conference, The Late General..... 551
Personnel..... 553
Colored delegates..... 554
Reports..... 555
Work done..... 556
Strength of Methodism in the future. 557
The lay element..... 557
Publishing interests of the Church... 560
"Consensus of Doctrines."..... 766, 767

Cooke: Outlines of the Doctrine of the Resurrection....Page 196, 784
Craik: Godfrey Helstone.... 601
Creed of Mankind, The Earliest.... 20
Polytheism the primary religion of mankind.... 20
Argument in support of....20–22
Lubbock classifies the first great stages of religious thought.... 25
Earliest men capable of entertaining the conception of a Supreme Being. 41
Crippen: A Popular History of Christian Doctrine.... 386
Crook: Biblical Hermeneutics.... 738
Crooks and Hurst's Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology.... 586
Crommelin: In the West Countrie.... 601
Curci, Padre: The Vatican Desiring a Royal Throne.... 581
Curry: The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.... 602
Curry: Some Aspects of the Epistle to the Romans.... 527
Curry: The Late Gen'l Conference: The Situation, the Work, and the Outlook. 551
Curry: Scriptural Doctrine of the Devil. 300
Curry: Teaching of the Twelve Apostles 697
Curtis: Life of James Buchanan.... 594
Davies: Authorship of Ecclesiastes.... 482
Devil, Scriptural Doctrine of the.... 300
Author of sin in man,....302–304
Personal embodiment of a great spiritual force....302–305
Character of, as given by Christ.... 303
The tempter to evil of moral beings. 305
Not a demon.... 309
Summary of his character and work. 315
Divine Love, Doctrine of.... 790
Dictionary, Catholic.... 793
Its character and design.... 794
Dictionary of Ecclesiastical History.... 179
Dillon: Christina, Persecuted Family.... 796
Discipline, The Administration of the... 80
The whole question discussed.... 81
Authority of the Church divine.... 83
The Church a theocracy.... 86
Church courts.... 87
Mode of dealing with offenders....88–96
Doctrine of the Resurrection, Outlines of the.... 785
Doctrines, Consensus of....766, 767
Dunn: Wesley's Designated Successor... 205
Dyer: Folk-Lore of Shakespeare.... 398
Eadie: Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Philippians.. 792
Eby: Christianity and Humanity.... 402
Ecclesiastes, Authorship of.... 482
Education: An International Magazine.. 348
Educators in Council, Christian.... 396
Edwards: Perla.... 203
Electra: Wilson-Leyburn.... 204
Elliott: Vindication of the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch.... 796
Ely: French and German Socialism in Modern Times.... 389
England, The Conquest of.... 395
English Men of Letters.... 601
Etter: The Preacher and His Sermon... 203
Evangelical Association of France..172, 174, 776
Evearts: John Foster, Life and Thoughts 597
Eytinge: Ball of the Vegetables, and Other Stories.... 203
Faiths of the World, The.... 384
Fauntleroy: Who's to Blame?.... 400
Father, Revelation of the.... 599
Fellows: The Story of Young Margaret.. 204
Field: Among the Holy Hills.... 394
Forbes: Chinese Gordon.... 601
Foreign Literary Intelligence..178, 365, 581, 780
Foreign Relig. Intelligence...175, 360, 577, 776
Foster: Beyond the Grave....Page 784
Foster: Centenary Thoughts for the Pew and Pulpit of Methodism.... 596
Foster, John.... 597
France, The Free Church of.... 380
French Protestantism, Fear of the Protestant Principle in the Ranks of.... 357
Froude: Luther: A Short Biography.... 403
Gardner: Light Ahead.... 600
George: Russia and England in Central Asia.... 467
Gilbert's Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England.... 185
Gnomic Aorist in the New Testament.... 337
Gobat.... 583
God and the Future Life.... 203
Goebal-Headingly: The Parables of Jesus. 591
Gospel According to St. Mark, The.... 402
Gospel According to Moses, The.... 204
Gospel of the Secular Life, The.... 600
Gracey: Outline Missionary Series.... 600
Grave, Beyond the.... 785
Grecian History, Mosaics of.... 204
Green: The Conquest of England.... 395
Guthe's Report of his Latest Excavations around Jerusalem.... 367
Guyot: Creation.... 386
Hamlet, A Psychological Study of.... 665
Harper's Frank. Sq. Library..203, 403, 601, 796
Harper's Young People.... 204
Harman: Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures.... 789
Harrington: The Popes at Avignon.... 678
Harrison's Living Christ.... 197
Hartzell: Christian Educators in Council. 396
Haswell: Mechanics and Engineers' Pocket-book of Tables.... 601
Hermeneutics, Biblical.... 738
The position of the Bible.... 738
Its antiquity.... 739
Aim of.... 742
Study of, important to Preachers..743, 745
Different methods of interpretation.. 751
Extracts from....752, 753
Parables, principles of interpreting.. 753
History of Biblical Interpretation and its importance....755, 756
Heroes of Christian history.... 599
History of the Christian Church.... 383
"History of the Index Expurgatorius.". 581
History of the Literature of the Scandinavian North.... 388
History of a Learned Man.... 778
Home College Series.... 403
Home: History of the Literature of the Scandinavian North from the Most Ancient Times to the Present.... 388
Hurst: Our Periodical Literature.... 46
Hurst: Short History of the Reformation 600
Hyde: The Last Days of John Wyclif.... 624
Index to the Methodist Quarterly Review. 598
Inheritance, A Golden.... 600
Italy, Catholic Congress in.... 361
Italy, Luther Festivals in.... 362
Jackson: The Regeneration and Glorification of the Body.... 439
James: The Soul-Winner.... 203
Jeans: The Creators of the Age of Steel.. 601
Jesus, Lessons on the Life of.... 204
Jewish Question in Germany, The.... 579
Journal of Christian Philosophy..158, 568, 775
Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.... 158
Keil: Views of Old Testament Canon. 381, 382
Knox: Boy Travelers in the Far East.... 203
Ladd: Doctrine of Sacred Scripture.... 180
Lanthern: The Macedonian Cry.... 599
La Nuova Scienza.... 772
Leaves from the Journal of a Life in the Highlands.... 600

Letters and Memorials of Jane Carlyle. Page 60
Liddon: "The Divinity of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ." 368
Light Ahead 600
Lindsay: Gospel According to S. Mark 402
Lipscomb: Psychological Study of Hamlet 665
Lipscomb: Studies in the Forty Days between Christ's Resurrection and Ascension 600
Little: Biblical Lights and Side Lights 593
Living Christ 197
Locke's Theory of Knowledge 387
London Quarterly Review, (Wesleyan) 768
Longking: Light to the Path 403
Love: Christ Preaching to Spirits in Prison 790
Lowe: Memoir of Charles Lowe 601
Luther, Martin 600
Luther Literature 179, 365, 366
Lutheran Quarterly 158
Macedonian Cry, The 599
Mair: Studies in the Christian Evidences 375
Mankind, The Doom of the Majority of 600
M'Carthy: A Short History of Our Own Times 395
M'Closkey, Cardinal, Letters to 600
M'Cosh: Agnosticism of Hume and Huxley 601
M'Cosh: Locke's Theory of Knowledge 387
Mead: Martin Luther 600
Mechanics and Engineers' Pocket-book of Tables 601
M'Elroy: The Administration of the Discipline 80
Mendenhall: Echoes from Palestine 390
Meyer: Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Epistles to the Corinthians 592
Meyer: Critical and Exegetical Hand-Book to the Gospel of John 791
Monks, Capuchin, A Revival Among the 779
Morley: English Men of Letters 601
Mothers in Council 600
Mounds in the Ohio Valley and along the Upper Mississippi 763
Miller: Conflict of Centuries 192
Miscellaneous 202, 402, 598, 795
Missions, Christian, Short History of 795
Miz-Maze, The 796
Mudge: Doctrine of God's Holy Word 796
Mulligan: The Gospel According to John Explained 204
Murray: By the Gate of the Sea 203
Murray: The Way of the World 601
Naville: Modern Physics 601
New Englander 158, 349, 759
New Testament, A Complete Concordance to the Revised Version 203
New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ 602
Nippold: "Manual of Church History." 582
Nordhoff: God and the Future Life 203
O'Connor: Letters to Cardinal M'Closkey 600
Oehler: Theology of the Old Testament 593
Old Testament Student 159
Oliphant: Harry Joslyn 203
Opium Traffic in China, The 420
1. Results to the victims 420, 424
2. Effect on missionary work 425
3. Its results to India 427
4. Its effect on general trade 428
Opinion of London bankers 429
Chinese opinion 430
Relation of United States to the trade 433
Efforts for the suppression of 436
What ought to be done? 437
Palestine, Echoes from 390
Pasteur, His Many and Important Discoveries 774, 775
Payn: Thicker than Water 204
Pearl, Raising the 600
Peck: Special Providence Illustrated. Page 204
Pentateuch, Vindication of the Mosaic Authorityship of 796
Pentateuch, The Higher Criticism of the 605
I. Passages not written by Moses 605
II. Documents in the 608
III. Ignorance and neglect of the Law after the age of Moses 610
IV. Relation of the Levitical and Deuteronomic Codes 613
Six reasons for rejecting theories of recent school of the higher criticism 621, 622
Periodical Literature, Our 46
Growth of, Poole's Index to 47
Increase of American journalism 52, 53
Treasures of periodical literature 54
Completeness and magnificence of 47
Physics, Modern 601
Pilcher: Index to the Methodist Quarterly Review 568
Poe's Raven, Illustrated by Doré 202
Pompeii, Christian Benevolence in 778
Poole: Ripe Grapes 204
Pope: A Higher Catechism of Theology 589
Positive Christianity and Orthodox Pietism 783
Prayer and its Answer 201
Prayer and Science 5
Nature controlled by mind 7
Law not of force, but of mind 8
Natural laws the result of divine volition 10
A change of volition may induce a change of law 11
God's knowledge of an event does not cause the event 12
Freedom of choice a divine perfection 13
An infinite being cannot be limited in any action 14
A supernatural influence may produce a supernatural result 16
Prime: Prayer and its Answer 204
Probation after Death 126
General faith of the Christian Church 127
Three classes of dissent 127
I. The sentiment held at and about the time of Christ 128–131
II. Scriptures adduced as teaching probation after death 131
III. Probation limited to earthly life 189
Probation after Death (Second Article) 316
I. The philosophical argument for future probation 317–324
II. The probationary condition of the heathen 325–330
III. Infant non-probation 330–333
IV. The awards of the day of judgment a finality 333, 336
Problem of our African Population, The 107
The colored population a great element of the working force of the nation; caste 109
Colonization our only hope 110
Voluntary Emigration to Africa 112
Protestant Churches of Italy 175
Protestant work in Spain 577
Providence, Special, Illustrated 204
Quarterly Book Table 180, 369, 584, 784
Reade: A Perilous Secret 796
Reade: "I say No." 796
Reformation, Short History of the 600
Regeneration and Glorification of the Body 439
Regeneration of the body coincident with that of the soul 439
Illustration of 440
A scriptural doctrine 442
Paul's glorying on this account 445
Matter of interest to the sinner 446
Of interest to the believer 447